DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 474 HE 031 252

AUTHOR	Trow, Katherine
TITLE	A Study of the Long Term Effects of an Experimental Program of Freshman-Sophomore Studies at Berkeley in the 60's.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Studies in Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1991-12-31
NOTE	184p.; For a related document, see ED 132 741.
CONTRACT	P116B80822
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Curriculum; College Freshmen; College Sophomores; Core Curriculum; *Experimental Curriculum; Followup Studies; *General Education; *Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Integrated Curriculum; Interviews; *Participant Satisfaction; Seminars; Team Teaching; Values
IDENTIFIERS	*University of California Berkeley

ABSTRACT

This project examined the long term effects of the Experimental College Program at the University of California, Berkeley, in the 1960s through interviews with 40 of the 200 students who completed the program and a questionnaire sent to program participants and similar nonparticipants (n=104). A team of 6 faculty taught 150 students, admitted randomly from applications among all 1965 and 1967 entering freshmen. A series of lectures, small seminars, and tutorials took the place of the usual freshman-sophomore unconnected set of courses, exams, and grades, and was intended to give students an integrated understanding and appreciation of great themes in Western civilization. Analysis of the interviews revealed a highly successful program. Thirty-seven of the 40 program participants interviewed would repeat the program again; only one respondent had any regrets about having participated. Many respondents reported that the program had taught them how to think, write, speak, and integrate these skills. Others noted the emphasis on educational values, ethics, the value of belonging to an integrated community within the large university, and the value of small seminars. Four papers are appended: (1) "The Experimental College in Retrospect: An Exploratory Study" (Katherine Trow); (2) "The Experimental College Program at Berkeley: Long Term Effects of an Experiment in Undergraduate Education" (Katherine Trow); (3) "The Experimental College Program at Berkeley: Long Term Effects and Implications for Educational Practice" (Katherine Trow); and (4) "A Venture in Educational Reform: A Partial View" (Joseph Tussman). Other appendices include the interview schedule, the questionnaire, and a report on college attitudes. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AE

ED 419 474

A STUDY OF THE LONG TERM EFFECTS OF AN EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM OF FRESHMAN-SOPHOMORE STUDIES AT BERKELEY IN THE 60'S

Award Number P116B80822-90

Katherine Trow
Project Director

HE031252

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Cover Sheet

Grantee Organization:

Center for Studies in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley
South Hall Annex
Berkeley, California 94720

Grant Number:

P116B80822

Project Dates:

Starting Date: 1 January 1989
Ending Date: 31 December 1991
Number of Months: 36

Project Director:

Katherine Trow
19 Kensington Court
Kensington, California 94707
Telephone: (510) 526-0714
Fax: (510) 643-6845

FIPSE Program Officer: David Holmes

Grant Award:

Original	$ 48,568
Dissemination	$ 7,800
Total	$ 56,368

Paragraph Summary

This project is a study of the long term effects of the Experimental College Program at the University of California, Berkeley in the 60's, an innovative departure from traditional curriculum and teaching modes. A team of six faculty taught 150 students, admitted randomly from applications in response to an invitational letter to all 1965 and 1967 entering freshmen, in a series of lectures, small seminars and tutorials. These took the place of the usual freshman-sophomore unconnected set of courses, exams and grades, and offered students an integrated understanding and appreciation of great themes in Western civilization and the bearing they have on the present, and led to an education for responsible citizenship. Forty of the 200 students who completed the Program over its two cycle, two-year duration have been interviewed intensively, and the analysis of their responses yields information about the success of the Program, its lasting effects and implications for improving the quality of undergraduate education, particularly in the first two years.

A Study of The Long Term Effects of An Experimental Program of Freshman-Sophomore Studies at Berkeley in the 60's

Award Number P116B80822

Katherine Trow, Project Director
19 Kensington Court
Kensington, California 94707
Fax c/o Center for the Studies in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley, California
510-643-6845

A Study of the Long Term Effects of An Experimental Program of Freshman-Sophomore Studies at Berkeley in the 60's

Center for Studies in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley, Ca. 94720
Katherine Trow, Project Director
(510) 526-0714

Executive Summary

A. Project Overview. The study was conducted between January, 1989 and December, 1991. During this period, 40 out of 200 former participants who had completed the Experimental College Program at Berkeley from 1964 to 1969 were interviewed intensively, their interviews recorded and transcribed, the transcriptions categorized and analyzed. This innovative departure from traditional curriculum and teaching modes consisted of a team of six faculty who taught 150 students each cycle admitted randomly from applications in response to an invitational letter to all 1965 and 1967 entering freshmen, in a series of lectures, small seminars and tutorials which took the place of the usual freshman-sophomore set of unconnected courses, exams and grades. The Program offered students an integrated understanding and appreciation of the great themes in Western civilization and the bearing they have on the present, and led to an education for responsible citizenship.

The analysis of the interviews has provided information about the effectiveness of the Program and its various components, its lasting benefits, and implications that can be drawn for the improvement of undergraduate education. The findings have been published as Occasional Paper #73 of the Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, and have been presented as papers at the University of New England, Armidale, Australia, and the Council for the Renewal of Undergraduate Education at the National Board of Universities and Colleges in Stockholm, Sweden. A paper summarizing the major findings of the study is being prepared. A book discussing the study and its findings in detail and drawing implications for educational practice is being written to be submitted for publication during the current academic year.

B. Purpose. This study of the long term effects of the Experimental College Program is designed to discover 1) whether former participants can remember some twenty years later enough of their experiences to tell us how the Program worked and what their reactions to it were, 2) whether there were any lasting effects of the Program and if so, what they were, and 3) what lessons could be learned from this experiment about the improvement of undergraduate education.

C. Background and Origins. The impetus for the study grew out of a talk about the Experimental College Program that its leader, Professor Joseph Tussman, gave to the Undergraduate Life seminar at the Center for Studies in Higher Education at Berkeley in 1986. Since twenty years had passed and there had been no follow-up study tracing its long-term effects, and in view of the concerns about undergraduate education, the time seemed ripe. Professor Tussman provided the names of four former participants living in the Bay Area who were willing to be interviewed for a pilot study. The pilot study demonstrated the ability of these former participants to remember their experiences there, their judgments about the effectiveness of the Program and its various components, and to give information about the lasting effects of the Program. It formed the basis of the proposal to FIPSE to extend the study.

D. Project Description. A total of forty former participants who had completed the Program and who lived in the Bay Area were interviewed extensively between March and November of 1989. Half of these forty were women, half men; half from the first cycle of the Program and half from the second. Respondents as a whole enjoyed the interviews, which lasted an average of two hours, and some said they had not talked to anyone outside the Program about it since they had graduated.

In addition, a questionnaire was filled out by respondents and was identical to one sent to former U.C., Berkeley students who had applied to the Program but had not been accepted, making a total of 104 questionnaires. The results were compared with the ACE Berkeley Freshmen survey for the years 1966 and 1967. Students who had applied to the Program, whether accepted or not, were found to be similar to the whole freshmen group in some respects, such as age, racial background, and father's education, but were different in one major respect: Program applicants were on the whole a somewhat more confident, academically better prepared group than their classmates, more likely to have gone to a private school, to have had an A- or better in high school, and mothers who were college graduates or had gone to graduate school.

E. Project Results. Analysis of the information from the interviews reveals a highly successful Program as judged by this group of its participants twenty years later. Thirty-seven of the 40 interviewed would repeat the Program again; only one respondent had any regrets about having participated in the Program.

The analysis provides evidence of a wide range of effects of the Program, some quite deep and lasting. Many respondents reported that the Program had taught them how to think, and how to think critically, and how to think independently; how to write; how to speak; and especially how to integrate these skills which they say still serve them well. For some respondents, the major impact of the Program on their lives was an increased awareness of educational values, and particularly the value of a liberal arts education, that had lasted all their lives. Some said what was most important to them was that the Program dealt with ethics and values, and led them to form their own. For some the major impact had been the concepts of citizenship and community that have been at the center of their lives ever since.

The Program served an important purpose in helping many respondents in their adjustment to university life. It gave them a sense of belonging to an integrated community within the large, impersonal university setting, and eased their entry into university life. Many reported gaining confidence in themselves in the Program that led them to feeling better prepared for upper division work than their classmates who had not been in the Program. The Program provided them a testing ground where they could experiment with learning skills in writing and discussion. Many respondents had been at the top of their high school graduating class, but when they arrived at Berkeley, they found they were not unique. Readjusting their estimates of their academic abilities as students in the Program gave them the support of an entire intellectual community while they went through this sometimes painful reassessment. Several reported that the enjoyment in learning they found in the Program contributed to their remaining in college rather than dropping out before graduation.

The effects of the Program were found in their vocational lives as well. People in business reported that they had had useful training in leadership there; others found skills and attitudes learned in the Program helpful in their chosen fields of education, law, social work, medicine, civil service and community organization.

Implications for educational practice which arise from the study center on pedagogy, curricular design, and the usefulness of such a program in meeting the needs of a diverse student body. Team teaching, that is, six professors teaching 150 students, permitted them to share lecturing responsibilities and freed them to spend more time in smaller seminars and tutorials. The "unattended" seminar where no faculty were present allowed students to practice skills learned from faculty and from each other. The absence of exams and grades allowed professors to concentrate on the intellectual development of their students through their discussions and paper-writing, and allowed the students to focus on the intellectual content of the Program and their own growth in learning. A set curriculum freed students from having to choose among the vast array of unconnected introductory courses comprising the usual lower division years. The coherence of the curriculum and the continuity of the same faculty and students studying together over a two-year period in the same physical location created a learning community of teachers and students. Diversity in the Program's design--lectures, small seminars both with faculty present and without, reading, paper writing, tutorials, and informal discussion--offered different modes of learning to all students.

The curriculum of this program, leading to an education for responsible citizenship, gave students a sense of tradition, of people dealing with the same social and moral problems throughout history. Reading the

Greeks, the Bible, Shakespeare, gave them a grounding in a liberal education rarely experienced in a large, research university.

The random selection of students and the focus of the Program on intellectual development rather than expertise in test-taking favored the inclusion of students from diverse backgrounds and a wide range of abilities. Women and men who felt shy in seminars could learn in the Program how to participate, and apply that learning in the upper division. In this highly interactive atmosphere, many women realized their intellectual interests for the first time. Some women and minority students, who might not have gone to graduate school, did so due to the influence of the Program. Students who either majored in science or math in the upper division, or switched after graduation, found the introduction to the humanities the Program gave them of lasting value.

F. Summary and Conclusions: Studies of this kind, using information from interviews of former participants in special experimental programs can add much to our understanding of their usefulness in improving undergraduate education. They can be especially valuable after several years have passed, allowing former participants time to reflect and to form mature judgments of their educational experiences.

Programs like the Experimental College Program have a place both in large, research universities where they offer an intellectual haven, and small liberal arts colleges where they can be models for curricular reform. Team teaching, a coherent curriculum centered on a major theme, faculty and students reading and studying together over a two-year period in the same place, create a real learning community where students play an equal part with faculty. Small seminars, papers, tutorials, and journals rather than huge lecture classes, exams and grades, provide opportunities for close faculty attention to intellectual development. The impacts of such a program as this can be lasting and expanding over time, as attested to by the respondents in this study.

G. Appendices:

A. Trow, Katherine, "The Experimental College in Retrospect: An Exploratory Study," Katherine Trow, June, 1987, unpublished.

B. Trow, Katherine, 'The Experimental College Program at Berkeley: Long Term Effects of an Experiment in Undergraduate Education," Occasional Paper #73, Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, January, 1991.

C. Trow, Katherine, "The Experimental College Program at Berkeley: Long Term Effects and Implications for Educational Practice," manuscript chapter outline.

D. Tussman, Joseph, "A Venture in Educational Reform: A Partial View," Occasional Paper #67, Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, December, 1988.

E. Experimental College Study Interview Schedule

F. College Attitudes Study Questionnaire

G. College Attitudes Study Report

C. Body of Report

Project Overview. The project began on 1 January 1989 with a one-year grant from FIPSE of $48,568. A no-cost extension extended that grant to 30 June 1990. A dissemination grant of $7,800 was awarded to cover the period 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991 with a no-cost extension to 31 December 1991. During this period, the study of "The Long-Term Effects of An Experimental Program of Freshman-Sophomore Studies at Berkeley" was carried out, and subsequent dissemination activities conducted.

Forty former participants in the Experimental College Program at Berkeley during the years 1965 to 1969 were interviewed extensively about their experiences in the Program and their judgments of the effectiveness of the whole Program and its various components. These interviews were tape recorded and transcribed, resulting in almost 6,000 pages of transcriptions.

These transcriptions have been coded, categorized and analyzed, and the resulting findings are being written up in three other forms, besides this report. One, a book discussing the study and its findings in detail and drawing implications for educational practices is being written and is to be submitted for publication during the current academic year. (A proposed outline for this book is included in this report as Appendix C.) Two, an article describing the study and its findings has been published as an Occasional Paper by the Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California at Berkeley. (A copy is included in the report as Appendix B.) Three, a paper summarizing the major findings and based on this report is being prepared.

Purpose: The problem addressed by the project was that of the long-term evaluation of special programs aimed at curricular reform in undergraduate higher education. Through the years, there exist numerous instances of efforts at curricular reform enthusiastically begun but ending, either successfully, and incorporated into existing structures with their experimental beginnings forgotten, or unsuccessfully, sometimes simply because of the exhaustion either of funding or of the energies of their founders, or both. Those are usually also forgotten by everyone but the faculty and students who participated, and the guidance these experiments might offer for improvements in undergraduate curriculum are then lost forever. The central questions posed and answered by this study are three: 1) Can former participants in a program some twenty years after its completion remember enough of their experiences to tell us how the program worked and what their reactions to it were? 2) Were there lasting effects of the program that former participants can identify? 3) What can be learned from what these former participants have to say about a particular program that can be of benefit to those of us who are interested in the problems of undergraduate education today?

Background and Origins: The impetus for the study grew out of an invitational seminar held from 1985 to 1988 at the Center for Studies in Higher Education on problems in undergraduate life on the Berkeley campus. Members of the Berkeley campus community were invited to speak to this group of scholars from different departments on the Berkeley campus as well as from neighboring campuses in the Bay Area. During one of these seminars in the spring of 1987, Professor Emeritus Joseph Tussman spoke about the Experimental College Program he led at Berkeley from 1965 to 1969. He talked of its beginnings, and how the administration dealt with his proposal; the problems he had in recruiting and retaining faculty for this program which took the full time of its six faculty members; of their experiences teaching in the Program. He spoke of his theories of undergraduate education--how he felt the lower division (the freshman-sophomore years) as it existed was an unconnected assortment of lecture courses designed to complete students' requirements for their upper division majors and little else, and how the Program was intended to offer them an education for "political vocation" through a study of themes of moral crisis running throughout history and taken up in "great" books. The Program was a complicated one, rich in innovational pedagogical theories and techniques and varied in its results, as far as they could be determined by Professor Tussman and other faculty at the time. (It has been described in Professor Tussman's book, Experiment at Berkeley, Oxford University Press, 1969.)

As a lecturer in the Clinical/School Psychology Graduate Program at San Francisco State and a practicing clinical and developmental psychologist, I had been engaged in the treatment of learning problems in children and young adults, involved in the relationship of teaching and learning, and concerned about the way in which schools as institutions were meeting the needs of students at different developmental levels, both cognitive and psycho-social. When I learned from Professor Tussman that no systematic, long term follow-up study of the "Tussman College," as it was called at the time, had ever been attempted, the time seemed more than ripe for such a review. He was receptive to the idea of a follow-up study, opened his files from the Program to me, and has been more than willing to talk to me about the Program at length over the course of the project. Subsequent to our initial conversations, he published his reflections of the Program as an Occasional Paper of the Center for Studies in Higher Education. That paper is included as Appendix D of this report.

Professor Tussman also supplied me with names of four former Program participants who lived in or near Berkeley, and they were all willing, most of them quite eager in fact, to be interviewed about their recollections of the Program. These exploratory interviews were conducted in order to test out the feasibility of a larger study, and became the pilot study that was the basis of the proposal to FIPSE, and which is included in the report as Appendix A. The pilot study demonstrated the ability of these four former participants in the Program to remember their experiences there, if not always in detail at least in broad enough outlines, and to talk about their feelings about the Program and their judgments of it. The glimpses they afforded of a very remarkable chapter in the history of undergraduate education at Berkeley, plus the knowledge they had of other former students in the Program who lived in the greater Bay Area and would be willing to be interviewed, led to the conclusion that a larger study involving more respondents would be eminently feasible and rewarding.

In addition, the pilot study was distributed to a number of scholars in the field of higher education both in the United States and abroad, and generated enthusiasm and professional support for the project, as well as providing helpful comments. One British scholar provided a small grant for the transcription of the initial four interviews. (Their statements about the proposed study can be found in the original proposal to FIPSE submitted in November, 1987.) The Acting Director of the Center for Studies in Higher Education, University Professor Neil J. Smelser, agreed to having the Center administer the grant. Professor Martin Trow, of the Graduate School of Public Policy, agreed to serve as the Principal Investigator. Other administrators on the Berkeley campus indicated an interest in the project, and also lent support.

Project Description: It was decided to increase the number of respondents to forty altogether, half of them men and half women, half from the first cycle of the Program and half from the second. Since this number represented approximately one-fifth of the number of students who were believed to have completed the Program, it would allow for comparisons to be made among these four groupings, and for some weight to be assigned to the interpretation of the results.

From a list of students completing the Program, the Alumni Records Office of the Berkeley campus provided addresses from their files. Together with a few names provided by other respondents, a list of fifty-five former Program participants living in the Bay Area was compiled. Letters were sent to people on this list explaining the study and the confidentiality of the interviews before interview appointments were made. Interviews were held in an office on the Berkeley campus (quite coincidentally in the building formerly used for the Program), in the offices and shops of respondents, in restaurants, in their homes, and in mine. The list of fifty-five names was sufficient to produce the intended number of forty interviews, distributed among the four categories. Only one person on the list who was approached "couldn't commit" and declined to be interviewed.

Interviews included a set of 55 questions, and were open-ended. (The interview schedule appears in this report as Appendix E.) They lasted an average of two hours, and some were almost four hours in length. Several were long enough to require two sessions, although most were completed in one. Respondents spoke openly and freely, and nearly all said they enjoyed the interview experience. For many, it was the first time they had talked about the Program since their college years. There were common themes running throughout the set of forty interviews, but they were not repetitious, and they represented each respondent's unique experiences in the Program.

Project Results: The results of the project are interpreted here to mean what we have learned from the study, that is, 1) whether such a study would be feasible twenty years after respondents' participation in a special program, 2) what impact (if any) the Experimental College Program has had on the lives of its former participants, and 3) the lessons for undergraduate education that can be learned from the study. The results will be summarized, but it must be emphasized that the summary presented here represents only the major conclusions of the study, and form only a part of what will be discussed in the book that will result from the study in which all aspects of the project mentioned here will be treated in much more detail and depth.

1) We conclude that this kind of study can be both feasible and meaningful. There was no problem in finding a large enough number of former students living within the greater Bay Area to give authority to interpretations of the results. Respondents were willing, often eager to participate.

The questionnaire sent to the former U.C., Berkeley students who had applied to the Program but had not been accepted was also successful in its purpose. (Copies of the questionnaire and the report sent to participants who requested it are included as Appendices F and G, respectively.) Two-thirds (44 out of 69) of those who were sent questionnaires returned them. Adding this group of applicants to the applicants who were accepted, and who filled out the same questionnaire at the time of the interview, we are able to compare the total group of Program applicants who had completed questionnaires with results of the ACE Berkeley Freshman Survey for 1966 and 1967. It should be noted here that this group of 104 Program applicants and participants do not represent a selected sample, but consist of just the people who filled out questionnaires. However, since about 650 students had applied to the Program, this number represents 16% of that whole group of Program applicants, a sizable number from which to draw inferences.

Students who had applied to the Program, whether accepted or not, were similar to the larger group of entering freshmen at U.C., Berkeley in most respects, such as age, racial background, and father's education, but were different in one major respect. Students in this group who applied for entry to the Program were on the whole a somewhat more confident, academically better prepared group than their classmates who entered the regular University. They were somewhat more likely to have gone to a private school, more likely to have had an A- or better grade point average in high school, and had mothers who were college graduates or had gone to graduate school. This confidence in their academic abilities undoubtedly influenced many students in their decision to apply to the Program.

Breaking down the groups of applicants to the Program to those who were accepted by chance to the Program and those who were not, we find evidence of the impact of the Program clearly visible over twenty years later:

* Half of the former students who had completed the Program report that they were "very satisfied" with their lower division experience, as compared with only 21% of the former students who were not accepted into the Program. And in contrast, only 22% of the Program participants said they had been "very satisfied" with their upper division at Berkeley, as compared with 42% of non-Program people. We could infer from this that Program students, having been more satisfied with their lower division experience in the Program, were then, by contrast, less satisfied with the upper division. In other words, the Program helped many of them set up expectations for the quality of their education which were not realized in the upper division. Evidence from the interviews bear out this inference.

* A significant aspect of the satisfaction with the Program may have come from closer association with faculty available there. Program participants (38%) were more likely than non-participants (21%) to say that there were professors in the lower division with whom they "felt free to turn to for advice on personal matters." Along the same lines, over half (53%) of the Program participants said there were professors at Cal who took special interest in their academic progress as compared to 38% of non-Program participants.

* Attitudes of the Program participants toward education were different from those of Program applicants who were not participants. Program participants, who received no grades while in the Program, were much more likely (47%) to agree with the statement that "undergraduate education would be improved if grades were abolished" than non-participants (14%), as expressed in the questionnaire. Participants were also more likely (86% to 67%) to agree that "undergraduate education would be improved if there were less emphasis on specialized training and more on broad liberal education." Since both groups had applied to the Program at the same time, they were similarly disposed toward the values of liberal education from the beginning. Experience in the Program clearly had an influence on these attitudes which was independent of their earlier leanings.

* It might be supposed that the conservative flavor of the "classic" curriculum of the Program, the Greeks, Shakespeare, the Bible, would appeal largely to students with conservative views. That was not the case, however. Answers to the questionnaire show that both groups of respondents remember themselves as predominantly left or liberal while at Cal: 90% of Program and 84% of non-Program respondents, reflecting the political climate of the time. It might also be supposed that the Program, with its classical curriculum and its intent to educate for responsible citizenship, may have served to influence the attitudes of its students toward adopting politically conservative views. Evidence from the answers to the questionnaire point in the opposite direction: while similar to begin with,

the Program participants are currently twice as likely to refer to themselves as "left" than non-participants (29% to 14%).

2) Turning now to the interviews, evidence emerges of a wide range of effects of the Experimental College on the lives of its former students, many of them quite deep and lasting. Before describing that impact, however, it may be useful to mention here the over-all judgments former students had of the effectiveness of the Program. First, thirty-seven out of the forty interviewed said they would repeat the Program if given the chance again. Two of the three who would choose not to repeat the Program would also choose not to attend U.C., Berkeley, but would prefer instead a small, liberal arts college. Second, only one of the forty interviewees had any regrets about having been in the Program. That participant felt the Program had not prepared her for further academic work--the only respondent who found this to be the case. The other two former students who would not repeat the Program nonetheless had no regrets about having participated in it.

While this study was never intended to be an evaluation of the Program--that would involve interviews with faculty, comparisons with other experimental programs at Berkeley and elsewhere at the time as well as other evaluative measures--it is still useful to know that over the passage of time, participants in the Program came to value what it had to offer them. Many respondents stated that they could not have made such evaluations twenty or even ten years ago, and certainly not at the time they were students in the Program.

Each respondent in the interviews reported the major impact of the Program for them, as well as other gains and benefits from their participation in it. Respondents' comments about these principal effects of the Program on their lives clustered around three major themes: 1) the educational structure of the Program; 2) the educational content and the curriculum of the Program; and 3) gains of a more personal nature that transcend the educational design.

1. Educational structure. Major elements of the Program that respondents saw as contributing to the success of the Program were:

* the fulfillment of all of their lower division requirements (with the exception of language) in the two-year program;
* the substitution of lectures, seminars and tutorials for ordinary classes; the absence of grades and exams (although for a few that was a somewhat difficult adjustment to make);
* the adisciplinary nature of the curriculum-- not organized around the academic disciplines;
* the continuity of books, ideas, faculty, students, and setting over a two-year period;
* the focus of the curriculum on one book at a time and the luxury of being able to do just that, rather than spreading their time and efforts over many reading lists at the same time.

The effects of these experiences on Program participants were often significant and lasting:

* Many respondents said that the major impact the Program had had on theirlives was that it had given them an increased awareness of educational values, particularly the value of a liberal arts education, that had lasted all their lives.

* For some, the major impact had been that they had learned how to think, and how to think critically; how to write; how to speak; and especially how to integrate these skills which they say still serve them well.

* Another crucial aspect of the Program for some respondents was the training for independent thinking that it fostered. Teaching students to think independently was a primary focus of the Program. That goal was achieved in large part by the insistence of the faculty that the students use primary, rather than secondary sources, and by faculty validation of students' opinions. These features also contributed to a sense of enablement or empowerment, or to use an old fashioned word, a sense of intellectual and personal efficacy for many respondents.

* One very important aspect of the Program was the community of scholars it allowed to be created among faculty and students. That sense of community shared by teachers and students, together with the cohesion of the curriculum and intimacy of it all, was of special importance for many respondents.

2. Educational content. The "guided tour" through some moral crises throughout history and the great books that had been written about them, with the aim of educating the Program's participants for responsible citizenship also had effects apart from its educational structure:

* For many respondents, the major impact of the Program had come through the values raised for consideration in the Program that led them to form their own. Those former participants responded particularly acutely to the ethical thread running throughout, and often found it reinforced previously held values as well as helping to formulate new ones.

* For others, the recurrence of "great ideas" through time and the sense of tradition throughout the course of history given to them as beginning undergraduate students was the major impact the Program had on them.

* Some respondents emphasized its educational and moral purpose and the political philosophy behind its design as being aspects of the Program that had the most impact on them.

* And for some, the concepts of citizenship and community nurtured in the Program had an impact of major dimensions that has lasted their entire lifetimes, affecting their vocational, civic, and personal lives.

3. Personal gains. Often former participants in the Program cited gains not strictly of an educational kind that were not part of the Program's design. These "unintended consequences" could be powerful, nonetheless:

* Some respondents said the most important effect of the Program had been the sense of belonging it gave them in contrast to the large, impersonal University surrounding them. The ease and protection it offered them as entering freshmen contributed to a feeling of success that influenced the rest of their university careers.

* Others stressed the importance of the confidence they gained in themselves through their experiences in the Program and with its faculty and how that confidence carried over to their upper division classes in the regular university and beyond. Many reported feeling better prepared for upper division than students who had not been in the Program.

* Another aspect of the Program which contributed to the sense of easing into collegiate life had to do with academic self-esteem. In line with the data from the questionnaire, many respondents reported that they came to the Program with a fairly high opinion of their own academic abilities, but that once enrolled in the Program at Berkeley that opinion was shaken in light of the performance of the many other capable students they encountered there. However, many also reported that going through that reassessment as students in the Program rather than in the regular University was substantially easier because the Program allowed them an intellectual and social identification with what they considered to be a worthy educational enterprise. To be a member of such a group, no matter how they judged themselves academically, served to protect them from an otherwise potentially devastating experience, allowing them to survive the reassessment with their egos intact.

* Some respondents attributed to the Program the capacity it gave them to take into account the viewpoints of others, and the interest it engendered in them in exploring and discovering other parts of the world.

* As to their vocational lives, respondents found positive effects in diverse areas: some found training in leadership in the Program useful in business; others found the skills and also the attitudes learned in the Program helpful in their chosen fields of education, law, social work, medicine, civil service and community organization.

* The enjoyment in learning they found there as opposed to what they might have experienced in the usual large undergraduate lecture courses had one significant effect for some respondents: they credited it with the motivation to remain in college when they might otherwise have dropped out before graduation, as many students did in those days.

A few quotes from the interviews themselves may help to give some of the flavor of these comments about the major impact of the Program.

* One woman experienced an intellectual awakening in the Program. "[The major impact was that] I realized that I enjoyed intellectual pursuits. It wasn't just to go to school and get a good grade . . . the notion that my thoughts were important, had some validity, that you didn't use secondary sources, that there wasn't a right or wrong answer . . . [Because of the Program] I didn't see myself as only a sorority person, not a very serious student. I think it helped me see myself more whole . . . .I went to graduate school partly as a result of the Program."

* A man, an underrepresented minority student, also speaks of the educational motivation the Program encouraged, as well as its lasting effects. He said of the Program's major impact on him: "My drive for more education was strongly pushed forward by participation in the Tussman Program. I went on to get my master's and my doctorate, and I lay a lot of that to the support and the motivators that I had working with me in the Program . . . . Now the Program to me is like a net, an intellectual net, and it has just stretched over time."

* A woman speaks of the influence of the Program on her critical thinking skills, and on her choice of career. She says that the major impact "is that I learned how to think, and how to read, and how to go to primary sources for information . . . . The other major impact has been . . . [that] I learned to value institutions in our society . . . and I've chosen a career in State service."

* Another woman spoke about the ethical impact of the Program: "It gave me a way of thinking about society and the individual . . . a kind of higher meaning of law, other than just a statutory point-by-point small-claims court idea. That was really important to me . . . And a kind of ethical responsibility . . . just a sense of yourself as a civic being."

* One man reported that "the big lesson I learned from the Program is my belief in community, the concept of community, and how important it is to be part of a community, whether it's a neighborhood, whether it's a city, making community a better place."

* For another man the major impact has been that "it awakened me to issues that continue to be near and dear to me. Questions of human nature, and political activity, a question of natural law and moral law, and first principles. And what is the relation of person to person, of man to man, man to his fellow citizen, of states to each other. The issues brought up in the Program seem to be still critical and still crucial."

* One woman describes the lasting value of the Program in this way: "I feel the foundation in law and the nature of government, of society, of man, is all useful . . . It really forced us, in a way most undergraduates are not, to think for ourselves . . . .I think it was one of the best decisions I could have made for my education."

* One man felt the greatest impact of the Program came from "the idea of a community of scholars, of being associated with the same faculty members, the same students over two years, with a physical location--this house. The chance to grow up with a group of people experiencing the

same things that you were. Not being caught in just your own little independent world in the regular University."

3) Implications for educational practice that arise from the study fall into several categories.

1. Pedagogical approaches.

* Special programs such as this one--which substitute a coherent set of readings, lectures, seminars, papers and tutorials for the usual undergraduate program of a random selection of courses consisting of lectures, exams and grades-- offer the beginning college student an early experience with self-directed education, an experience which occurs usually only at the graduate level.

* If a set curriculum of a classical nature can be welcomed and valued by students during the politically turbulent and revolutionary atmosphere of the 60's, can there be doubt that it could be appreciated in more politically normal times as well? Even in the days of the "do-it-yourself" educational climate on the Berkeley campus, students were content and pleased to have their lower division education designed for them by people who knew more about education than they did. Rather than resisting the "givenness" of the Program's requirements, many respondents indicated relief that after acceptance in the Program, there were no further educational decisions they had to make (except for the one about their outside class) for the remaining two years. Thus they were left free to concentrate on the crucial moral and intellectual questions generated in the Program. They were also able to focus their educational efforts on the intellectual content of the Program, rather than mainly on the accumulation of credits, the completion of their lower division requirements, their GPAs, common concerns of students in the regular freshmen-sophomore years who take the usual assortment of unconnected lecture classes.

* Many students thrive and prosper educationally when free of worries over exams and the competition for grades, if careful attention to their written work is used instead to measure their intellectual development. Some students are uncomfortable without more specific measures of their academic success and prefer the usual lecture/exam/grades routine. Slow learners (but those capable of university work) and slow readers profit from the kind of individual approach used in the Program which allows for more detailed diagnosis of their intellectual development. They also profit from a Program which requires reading just one book at a time.

* Team teaching is productive and worth the extra effort faculty must put into that kind of teaching, as opposed to the solitary safety of the lecture hall. Differences and disagreements among faculty in interpreting the curriculum content were almost universally experienced as stimulating and enjoyable by these respondents.

* The major difficulty in staffing special programs such as this, particularly at research universities, is in finding faculty able to leave their research for a year or two to engage entirely in teaching of a more personally demanding nature than the regular lecture arrangement. Not only is their teaching subject to collegial scrutiny, they are required to deal publicly with intellectual material often outside their realm of specialty. Retention of faculty becomes crucial to the continuation of such programs, but also to the satisfaction of the occasional student who feels let down if some faculty prematurely leave this close faculty-student arrangement for whatever reason.

2. The value of community.

* The pedagogical structure of a program such as this allows for the creation of a community of scholars that is powerful in its effects. If faculty are carefully chosen, there will arise a special collegiality among them. Students and faculty alike will experience a sense of the community of scholars which allows for a real feeling of collaboration to develop among faculty, between faculty and students, and among students.

* Participation in the same special, small, intimate educational process, particularly if it is given its own location within the larger institution, allows for interaction between students over aspects of the curriculum as well as allowing for more ordinary socialization to take place. In this way, the study groups with both faculty and other students that are known to be particularly valuable to undergraduates, and attested to by the research of the Harvard Educational Seminars, are easily developed.

3. The value of diversity.

* The Experimental College Program was varied in its many components, and offered a wide range of learning opportunities for its students not usually available in the lower division. The curriculum, ranging from the Greeks, Shakespeare, the Bible, and the American Federalist period through to the writings of Freud and Malcolm X, was given high marks by respondents. Each had favorites in the selection, and conversely each found some selections dull or difficult. There was far from unanimous agreement among respondents on these categories. The unanimous agreement was that the readings as a whole were valuable and enjoyable. Respondents report feeling glad today that they have read them, even the ones they had not always found enjoyable.

* The network of readings; of lectures based on readings; of small seminars dealing with the readings and related topics, both with faculty present and absent; of students' papers dealing primarily with the topics raised by the readings; of tutorials and journals (when they were conscientiously done) dealing with all of the above, formed a circuit of reading, thinking, writing, and discussion which helped students develop skills in all these areas, and certainly as important, to integrate these skills.

* The inclusion of six faculty members who taught collectively in the lectures but individually in seminars and tutorials allowed students to learn from a variety of perspectives, and to compare those perspectives. Students were able to find among the six at least one (and sometimes more than one) faculty member whose approach was particularly meaningful to them.

* The random selection of students permitted all types of students to be represented in the Program--serious students, cheerleaders, fraternity and sorority members, political activists, ROTC members. The focus of the Program on its intellectual content also insured that all of these types could interact intellectually rather than from a purely social base, at the same time that the informality and proximity found in the "House" assigned to the Program, an old fraternity house, afforded an ideal setting for this kind of interaction, unlike the random selection at dorms or the social selection at fraternity and sorority houses. The intellectual interests of all students in the Program were validated and taken seriously by the entire Program community.

* A broader spectrum of intellectual interests and abilities was represented in the student body than would have resulted from a purposeful selection of only students with the highest grades and test scores. Students less academically gifted than others in the Program gained self-esteem from identification with the Program as a whole. The Program, which could be thought of as elitist in its curriculum, was effective with students with a variety of academic skills and backgrounds.

4. High school preparation for the Program

* Since the emphasis in the Program was on the development of critical reasoning skills, rather than the accumulation of knowledge, no particular high school preparation was necessary for the Program. A few students who had read some of the Greeks in high school needed to reread them for the Program. Faculty and students read the selections simultaneously; everyone began at the same place. There was no question of remediation, only of development.

* If students felt at all unprepared for collegiate work, it was in the area of discussion. But several who felt their performance in discussions to be inadequate in the Program at first, said they were able to learn from others in the Program, faculty and students, how to participate in discussions, and to carry over that learning to upper division classes at Berkeley.

* Respondents who said they had had training in participation in classroom discussion in high school felt that was useful to them in the Program where there was much opportunity for discussion. In preparing high school students for college, more attention might profitably be paid to the development of seminar skills. Beginning college students could benefit from that training as well. The need on the part of faculty for more training in classroom teaching and in leading seminars has certainly been gaining recognition and should not be overlooked.

5. Factors involved in choosing to apply to the Program

* Many students were attracted to the Program because of its promise of a smaller, more intimate setting with closer faculty relations than the regular lower division at Berkeley. There is a deep-felt need on the part of a great many students for such experiences, as attested to not only by this study but also by the Maslach report published recently at Berkeley which was based on extensive interviews with students currently enrolled (Promoting Student Success at Berkeley: Guidelines for the Future, Report of the Commission on Responses to a Changing Student Body, Professor Christina Maslach, Chair, University of California, Berkeley, 1991.) Among the current recommendations of the Commission are smaller classes, developing more effective writing and public speaking components in courses, and reforming the "sink or swim" culture on the Berkeley campus, all of them features of the Experimental College Program back then. While efforts to introduce seminars at the freshmen level, smaller classes and the like are moves in the right direction, they do not address the underlying assumption, as the Program did, that the lower division is simply preparation for the upper division major.

* Several respondents who had been interested in small, innovative liberal arts colleges such as Antioch and Reed but were not able to apply to them, usually because of financial considerations, thought of the Experimental College Program as a good alternative. There can be room even at large, public research universities, as the Program demonstrated, for smaller, innovative programs to fill the needs these students expressed. Indeed, some respondents felt the Program at U.C., Berkeley offered them the "best of both worlds", that is, a small program staffed by excellent teachers within a leading research university.

* Since the invitation to apply to the Experimental College Program arrived during the summer after high school graduation, few teachers were involved in the decision to apply. Only a very few respondents had been encouraged to apply to the Program by teachers who knew about it; one minority student was encouraged to apply by a U.C. graduate student working in a local high school. There exists a need for better publicity for such programs, for high school teachers and counselors to be informed, so that prospective students receive the best information available. There is no reason why students who currently are participants in such programs can not help in "outreach" activities, speaking with youngsters in local high schools, particularly in areas where under represented minority students might not be as likely to consider such an unusual beginning for their college education.

6. The value of the Program to certain sub-groups of students

* Many women and some men reported feeling shy as beginning undergraduates, particularly in seminars. As previously mentioned, both faculty and other students who were more comfortable with

discussions served as role models for the shyer ones, and they eventually learned these skills in the Program. Several felt it was a safe place for them to learn and practice these skills, in contrast to the regular, large lower division lecture classes. Many woman students, perhaps used to achieving recognition in high school for knowing the right answers and not causing problems in the classroom, might have found the emphasis in the Program on challenging the written and spoken word and on heated debate somewhat difficult to adjust to. The performance of others around them more comfortable with these modes of learning and expression then served as encouragement and training.

* Several women respondents who thought they were not able to give the Program their best efforts at the time expressed a wish to be able to enroll in such a program now that they had matured and felt freer to turn to intellectual matters than they had as lower division students. This does not mean that they did not gain at the time from the Program, but that they were not able to take advantage of all it had to offer. While benefits of the Program to lower division students have been amply demonstrated by this study, this finding suggests the possibility that such a program could be made available to people not enrolled in college, say through Extension classes. Professor Tussman has suggested this possibility, as well as the idea of offering the Program in a community college setting.

* Some women discovered for the first time their intellectual interests and were able to pursue them through to graduate school and to academic and/or professional life. Several respondents, both men and women, and minority students, said they owed their motivation to attend graduate school to the Program. Their experiences in the Program enabled students from groups less likely to pursue a graduate education to aspire to and achieve this goal.

* The four minority members among the respondents (a combination of Asian, Hispanic, and Afro-American) were for the most part appreciative, and some were enthusiastic, about what they learned in the Program. Conditions in the Program were favorable to minority students who might suffer in the larger University because of inadequate high school preparation. Along with other students, they received close attention to their intellectual development through their writings and small seminar participation, and profited from the opportunity for close relationships with faculty that was built into the Program. As the Program offered a safe haven in the midst of the turmoil of the larger Berkeley scene, it functioned as a kind of incubator for beginning students, and as a cushion to protect them against the culture shock many respondents expressed at coming to a university the size of Berkeley. The increased confidence in themselves they were able to gain in the Program made the transition to upper division easier. The Program itself had evidence that students who completed it were more likely to graduate from college than others, suggesting that Programs such as these might very well serve to increase the retention rate for minority students as well as for undergraduates in general. The notion that "dead old

white men" had nothing to offer these students from minority backgrounds was disproved by the experiences of minority students in the Program. They received an elite education in a non-elite program.

* To suppose that students interested in science or engineering could not afford the two years the Program took away from their requirements was a reasonable idea, but not necessarily borne out in fact. There was evidence from one respondent, who was determined to become a biologist, and did, that by taking science requirements over the summers and in classes outside the Program, she could complete both sets of requirements. While completion of the Program allowed students to complete all their undergraduate social science requirements, and many went on to major in one of the social sciences, not all went in that direction. One respondent majored in math; three others who had majored in the social sciences as undergraduates later enrolled in branches of medical science in graduate school. These respondents who went from the Program into science courses, rather than resenting time spent away from science courses, almost unanimously were grateful for the education and outlook the Program had provided them. The assumption that a program such as this is not suitable for students wishing to pursue majors in the sciences needs to be reexamined in the light of the experiences of these former students.

* Several participants in the study had lived at home during their years in the Program and had commuted to the Berkeley campus. Many reported that the Program had provided them a kind of home away from home, a place to go to study or socialize on the campus that they would not have had otherwise. At the same time, some regretted the fact that they could not take advantage of these benefits in the evenings because of their need to return to off-campus living units. More thought could be given to the problems of this special group of students, and efforts could be made to help them find such oases on the campus.

7. Criticisms of the Program

* Respondents were asked what changes they would make in the Program. Six of the forty would make no changes at all; several other students would make only minor changes, "tinkering" as they put it. Other changes suggested by respondents fell into the same categories as did the comments on the major impact of the Program: educational, curricular, and personal.

* Respondents who suggested changes in the educational structure of the Program wished for faculty to be more aware of the difficulty some students had in participating in seminar discussions, and their need to be drawn into them. And while their papers were being read by faculty with attention to intellectual expression and development, several respondents felt more attention should have been paid to the technical side of their writing (and these are all students who had passed the reading and writing entrance exam.) At the same time many other participants said the writing skills they developed in the Program were among its most valuable assets. It

seems fair to conclude that for these former students writing as well as public speaking were top priorities, as they are today. These criticisms deserve faculty attention, and should be addressed within the design of programs like these, as well as regular lower division courses.

* As to the curriculum, some respondents felt it could have been put in a more historical context, or been more interdisciplinary, neither of which was the intention of the Program's design. If that is not to be changed, students perhaps need to be reminded from time to time that those two dimensions were omitted from the Program purposefully. Tussman has admitted there were problems in the second--the "American"--year. Several respondents thought the second year was not as good as the first, particularly in the selection of readings. However, two of them, both very enthusiastic about what the Program had given them, stated that it all "came together" for them only during the last part of the second year, implying that that second year, however less well organized than the first, was nonetheless important.

* Suggestions of a personal nature included more structured social events to promote student 'bonding" and encourage the development of relationships. Evidently some students needed drawing out socially as well as in seminar discussions, although other respondents reported taking part in many social activities with others in the Program, often taking place right at the House.

* Some respondents also expressed the need for guidance in interpersonal relations, in the choice of majors, in planning careers. While it was never the intent of the faculty of the Program to provide this kind of counseling and advice themselves, Professor Tussman reports that faculty in the Program were sometimes overwhelmed by the needs some students evidenced in these areas. It could be helpful if these needs were recognized and some steps taken to address them in the design of such programs. This might take place through the program itself, perhaps in the form of a kind of house manager or resident assistant, as Tussman has suggested, or through an outreach Program from the centers on campus that do offer such services.

Summary and Conclusions

In summary, we repeat the central findings of the study: This study of the long range impact of the Experimental College Program on its former participants was both feasible and meaningful. An analysis of the transcriptions of forty interviews produced insights into the meaning of the Program for its participants, the major impact it had, its gains and benefits, what changes they would make to improve it, the value of its many components--faculty, lectures, small seminars, readings, papers, tutorials, its establishment of a community of scholars, of teachers and students.

Respondents attested to the motivation for learning and further education, and the training for independent thinking that the Program provided them. They learned how to think, how to write, how to speak, and especially how to integrate these skills in the Program. It helped them become aware of the issues of values and ethics, and to value society's institutions. It provided them with a sense of belonging and protection as entering freshmen, and gave them a confidence in themselves that contributed to a feeling of success that in turn influenced the rest of their university careers.

The Experimental College Program at Berkeley was a successful, courageously innovative experiment in undergraduate curricular reform that leaves as its endowment the gratitude of its participants and some lessons for the improvement of undergraduate education. The Meiklejohn-Tussman model has been followed and adapted at other colleges and universities, and deserves more widespread recognition for its positive long-term effects.

In respect to the establishment of other such programs, the history of the Experimental College at Berkeley points to several areas of consideration. To begin with, the thorny problem of staffing such programs must be successfully addressed to allow them to continue, if they are successful, beyond the usual brief, experimental period. Evergreen College in Washington, begun in 1970, has adapted its entire four undergraduate years to this model, avoiding a staffing problem, and is thriving. It has spawned many other programs at other colleges and universities also based on this model. Small, private or public liberal arts colleges enjoy relatively more freedom to experiment with programs like these. Carleton College in Minnesota has used the Program's curricular design, as described in Tussman's Experiment at Berkeley, (Oxford University Press, 1969), in reviewing their own. Malespina College in Canada has recently initiated a two year upper division program in conjunction with the University of Victoria which is modeled in large part on the Tussman-Meiklejohn Programs.

Versions of these kinds of learning communities established as parts of larger, research oriented universities often go against the grain of administrative and faculty habits and beliefs about undergraduate education. Therefore, support needs to be built on that kind of campus both in the planning stages and after the program is functioning in order to improve its chances for success. In the current climate of interest in undergraduate teaching, it might be possible to get real commitments from concerned administrators to make it possible for faculty to take time off from research and other teaching demands of upper division and graduate studies in order to participate in such demanding programs. The penalties of time lost in the tenure and promotion ladder must be counteracted in order for these programs to be able to attract qualified teachers. To staff a program like this entirely with visiting faculty, as Tussman did in the second cycle of the Experimental College, is to ensure no continuity in teaching, as it is unlikely visiting faculty can be granted tenure to teach in a program that is not a department. It would also confer second class status on these faculty who would never be a permanent part of the university.

At the end of the second cycle of the Program, when Tussman was considering trying for a third cycle, he contemplated a staff that was a combination of visiting and regular Berkeley faculty, with a more or less permanent component of two tenured Berkeley teachers, perhaps as co-directors, as an anchor, similar to the arrangement instituted at Evergreen College. Such an arrangement seems feasible, although it must be borne in mind that these teachers must not only be willing to take the necessary time out from regular teaching and research to participate in a program like this, they must also all be able to agree with the central theme of the curriculum, whatever that may be, and share the founder's beliefs about what the program should look like.

The role of leader or director of the program, or if there is to be one at all, needs to be planned for. Apparently, Professor Tussman anticipated no such formal need when he designed the Program; sometime during the first year he reluctantly assumed the functions if not the title of this role. Directors, formally designated, besides serving the usual needs of a program, can be helpful in passing on the philosophy underlying its creation and design. Sometimes, as in the case of the Experimental College Program at Berkeley, the program would not have come into being in the first place, and continue on for as long as it did, without the vision, the drive, the energies and the charisma of its director.

On another level, more attention could profitably be paid to needs of program students other than of an intellectual kind. Just bringing students together in an intellectually stimulating and educationally satisfying setting for two years does not ensure that all their personal and social needs will be met. And they should not necessarily be by a program like this. Steps can easily be taken, however, to help in the adjustment of beginning students and thereby influence retention rates. For example, retreats, such as those offered in the Program at the end of the year, could be more regularly held, and become the vehicle for an orientation to the Program and to campus life. More attention to the problems students face in choosing majors in the upper division might be begun in the Program, perhaps through out-reach services from counseling centers and the like.

And last but not least, plans for evaluations of programs like these should be built into the overall design. Mailing lists of graduates should be kept up to date so that former students can be available for surveys and interviews. Because so many respondents in this study said they had come to realize all the benefits of the Program only over the passage of time, plans should be made for long term studies. Graduates inevitably scatter to all parts of the country and overseas, but many also remain in the immediate area, or within a short distance of the university. Since so many respondents in this study enjoyed the opportunity to discuss their experiences in the Program, it is possible to imagine the benefits of periodic symposia of graduates discussing with faculty, administrators and students ways to capitalize on the success of the Program as well as ways to improve it.

Application of the findings of this study to undergraduate education as a whole center on the expressed need of undergraduates, particularly at large, public research universities such as Berkeley, for closer faculty relations in the form of associations in various kinds of learning communities. Freshmen seminars, clusters of related courses for freshmen, all begin to address the need of beginning students for a more coherent approach to undergraduate education. The inclusion of undergraduates, sometimes as early as the sophomore year, in faculty research projects being conducted on campuses of the University of California also help involve students with their professors in collaborative learning situations, although they may at the same time serve to apprentice students prematurely to specific fields of study before they have had a chance to explore all that is available to them.

But these are piecemeal solutions at best, and available usually to only a small number of students. They share as well the assumption that the lower division is primarily preparation for the upper division major. In addition to these efforts to improve undergraduate education, coherent programs, rather than individual courses, could be made available to larger numbers of students, and could be adapted for different curricula as well as the Experimental College Program as Professor Tussman envisioned it. A program centered around problems in the relationship of science to the environment, or the history of technology and its effects, or the history of migration and ethnic and racial relations in the United States, or other countries, are just a few examples.

Programs that offer their students a coherent, integrated curriculum for longer than one semester or term allow for students to grasp the larger meaning of what they are reading and studying. The substitution of close reading of frequently written papers for exams and grades, where that is possible, offers students from various backgrounds and with varying abilities a chance to develop learning and thinking skills rather than simply demonstrating the accumulation of knowledge. Collaborative teaching arrangements allow the task of lecturing on course material to be shared, so that more faculty time can be spent on attending to the intellectual development of their students. Small programs of 100 to 150 or so students taught by a team of professors around a single theme and extending well beyond the semester or quarter term allows for a community of scholars to arise in which students play an integral part along with faculty.

The effects of such programs, as this study has demonstrated, while diverse and individual, can be strengthening and rewarding. They can be subtle and they can be profound. They can be lasting, and expanding, as the respondent who described the Program as an "intellectual net that has stretched over time." They deserve the attention of those who care about undergraduate teaching and learning, and are looking for ways to improve both.

Dissemination

Dissemination activities continue and keep abreast of the findings of the study as they emerge from the analysis. Revised versions of the occasional paper have been delivered at the FIPSE Project Directors Meeting of 18 October 1990 in Washington, D.C., and the University of New England in Armidale, Australia, in July 1991. Another talk on aspects of the findings of the study is scheduled to be delivered in Stockholm, Sweden in March of 1992 at the Council for the Renewal of Undergraduate Education of the National Board of Universities and Colleges. In addition to a full-length book, articles covering some of the findings of the study in greater depth (for example, about the role such a special program can play in a large, public research university and about the kind of teaching required in such a program and its rewards and difficulties) are being prepared for publication in scholarly journals and periodicals.

Several projects come to mind as logical steps following the completion of the book. Some have to do with the study of the Program itself. One, it would be useful in furthering our understanding of the pedagogy in the Program to talk with more of the faculty who taught there. Several still live in the Bay Area, and could be interviewed. Two, people who dropped out of the Program and therefore were not included in the study should be interviewed. Many of those drop-outs are living in the Bay Area, and interviews with them about their experiences in the Program would shed light on matters of retention for programs like these. In addition to these, it is possible there might be an application of some of the features of the Program to fit the humanistic aspects of the education of engineering students. This project is being explored in conjunction with Professor Martin Trow at the Graduate School of Public Policy at Berkeley.

Appendices

A. Trow, Katherine, "The Experimental College in Retrospect: An Exploratory Study," Katherine Trow, June, 1987, unpublished.

B. Trow, Katherine, 'The Experimental College Program at Berkeley: Long Term Effects of an Experiment in Undergraduate Education," Occasional Paper #73, Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, January, 1991.

C. Trow, Katherine, "The Experimental College Program at Berkeley: Long Term Effects and Implications for Educational Practice," manuscript chapter outline.

D. Tussman, Joseph, "A Venture in Educational Reform: A Partial View," Occasional Paper #67, Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, December, 1988.

E. Experimental College Study Interview Schedule

F. College Attitudes Study Questionnaire

G. College Attitudes Study Report

Appendix A

Trow, Katherine
The Experimental College in Retrospect:
An Exploratory Study

June, 1987

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY 3

FACTORS LEADING UP TO APPLICATION TO THE PROGRAM 7

PREPARATION FOR THE PROGRAM 8

REACTION TO THE STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THE PROGRAM 11

COMMENTS ON FACULTY 28

RELATIONSHIP OF THE PROGRAM TO OTHER UNIVERSITY EXPERIENCES 31

EFFECT OF THE PROGRAM ON CAREERS AND CONTINUING ACADEMIC LIFE 37

THE SETTING: BERKELEY IN THE SIXTIES 41

FURTHER RESEARCH 44

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 1964, Professor Joseph Tussman of the Philosophy Department at UC Berkeley developed a proposal and began discussions with President Clark Kerr and senior administrative officers which led to the establishment of the Experimental Program, modeled after the Experimental College founded by Alexander Meiklejohn at the University of Wisconsin in the 1920's. In his book, Experiment at Berkeley, (1969), Tussman describes the program as

> "an attempt to provide a coherent scheme of liberal education for the first two undergraduate years -- a time during which the student is not yet pursuing a 'major.' The structure of the program is quite unlike the traditional one, but it has a structure of its own, which governs the educational life of its faculty and its students. It is not organized in terms of courses or academic subjects. It is instead, based on a common, required curriculum -- a program of reading, writing, and discussion." (p. 131)

He goes on to say:

> "The core of the program is a sequence of reading. The reading not only poses a number of persistent problems but serves as a focus for writing and discussion. In general, the readings themselves cluster about some periods in Western civilization during which a major crisis evokes a broad range of thoughtful and creative response. During the first year the focus is on Greece during the Peloponnesian wars and on seventeenth-century England. The second year focuses on America."

A sample of some of the readings includes the Iliad, the Odyssey, Thucydides, Plato, the Bible, Hobbes in the first year, and The Federalist Papers, Thoreau, Marx, Freud and Malcolm X in the second year.

The Experimental Program was the first of several attempts at undergraduate curricular reform carried out on the Berkeley campus in the sixties and seventies. It is important to note, however, that although the Experimental Program (originally called the Experimental Collegiate Program), appeared to begin this series of reforms, and actually opened its doors in the fall of 1965, it was in no way connected to the Free Speech Movement, which did have some influence on subsequent curriculum changes. This was a common misperception among students who enrolled in the program in 1965, and also in its second cycle two years later.

The Program originally received over three hundred applications from entering freshmen from which 150 (75 women, 75 men) were selected randomly, and admitted. An old recently vacated fraternity house at the north edge of the campus was assigned to the Program for office and meeting space, both formal and informal. Four faculty members besides Professor Tussman were recruited for the first year of the program, 1965-66, together with five teacning assistants. By the beginning of the second year, two of these faculty members had dropped out; these two and all the teaching assistants were replaced by three new faculty members. For the second cycle, beginning in the fall of 1967, five entirely new faculty joined Professor Tussman. All five were recruited from other universities as visitors not on the tenure track. At the end of the second full cycle, in the spring of 1969, the Program was discontinued, primarily due to problems of recruitment and tenure among staff. Professor Tussman returned to the Philosophy Department; the remaining faculty left Berkeley.

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

This exploratory study, based on interviews with four Program alumni, is an attempt to shed light on one unique experimental attempt at curricular reform, as seen through the eyes of student participants themselves twenty years later. It is intended to serve as a basis for a further, more extensive review. This study does not attempt to gather detailed information about the curriculum content of the Program, an aspect perhaps best left to the creators and teachers of that curriculum. Of course, four students can hardly be taken as representative of the nearly two hundred students who completed the Program during the four years of its existence. The second step following this exploratory study, it is hoped, will be an extension of this survey to include twenty or thirty former students from the Program, allowing the development of themes and reactions introduced by these first four respondents, and adding new ones.

In spite of the small number of this first set of interviews, the wealth of material obtained from them seems to the interviewer rich and varied, representing the first layer of an intellectual excavation promising yet more rewards to come. It should allow us a way to get closer to the experience of the Program alumni and in a sense, to learn what it is we want to know, what questions we want to ask.

The responses of the four alumni to the interviewer's questions together with their spontaneous comments spring from recollections over a span of twenty or almost twenty years. The time period the Program spanned was itself one of great tumult on the Berkeley campus, so that memories of the Program and its impact on the students is set against, and woven together with, strong reactions to a vivid series of historical, social and political events. One might have wished for a "purer" kind of background on which to set this retrospective. On the other hand, the campus setting at the time makes a study of the Program also a reflection of the way the issues in those lively and turbulent times related to the Program's effect on its participants: a footnote to an important moment in collegiate history, as it was experienced by some students who found themselves in a unique educational setting.

This study began in the spring of 1986. Professor Tussman provided the interviewer with the names of four former students in the Program who he knew lived in the area and who he thought would agree to be interviewed. The list included one person from the first cycle, and three from the second; two women and two men. All were quite willing to be interviewed, some were quite enthusiastic. In response to a question, all replied that they had felt the interview to be worthwhile, and some said they quite enjoyed it. Each respondent provided a list of from two to ten names of additional people in the Bay Area and Northern California whom they believed would be willing to be interviewed.

In order to give some structure to the interview, and allow for comparability, an interview schedule of some 30 questions was developed. Much, if not most of the information was given in response to the first few general questions asking for a description of the Program, or given spontaneously after the interview began. In other words, the process of collecting information during these interviews was more like opening a door to an overflowing closet and catching what fell out than like eliciting discrete answers to discrete questions in an orderly fashion.

Interviews lasted from one to two hours. The interviewer was impressed with the vividness and intensity of the respondents' recollections of this period in their lives, a response suggesting the depth of the impact of the Program. Quite coincidentally, the interviews were held in a room in the old Beta Theta Pi building which housed the Program and which now houses the Graduate School for Public Policy, and the setting undoubtedly contributed to stimulating memories and feelings.

The interviewer sometimes asked questions not included in the schedule in order to respond more sensitively to what each respondent had to say. Some questions originally included were judged not to be relevant to the purpose of the exploratory study as it progressed, and dropped from the schedule. Not every question, then, was asked of each respondent. Information came forth in each case in a somewhat different sequence and with a different emphasis on different areas. The original interview schedule is attached as appendix A. For the purposes of clarity and confidentiality, responses quoted here have been slightly edited.

The analysis which follows is organized around the following categories: factors leading up to application to the Program; preparation for the Program; reaction to the Program's structure and its content; comments on faculty; relationship of the Program to other university experiences; effects of the Program on careers and continuing academic life. Various features of the Program will be described in this report, but for a fuller understanding of the ideas behind the Program as well as of the structure and curriculum as planned it will be necessary to refer to Experiment at Berkeley.

FACTORS LEADING UP TO APPLICATION OF THE PROGRAM

There was a fair amount of consistency in responses to questions about the initial contact with the Program; with one exception, noted below, none had heard about it before the letter inviting them to apply. That the

Program was small, allowing for one to one student/faculty interaction, was experimental, and operated on a pass-fail basis were all mentioned as appealing features. Acceptance to the Program was viewed entirely in the context of attending Berkeley; no one would have gone elsewhere if not accepted into the Program. The parents of one respondent applied for him as he was traveling in Europe at the time; the description of the Program appealed to them, and would to their son, they thought. It did. Another respondent discovered later that his father had not wanted him to be in the Program, or to go to Berkeley, but to enroll instead in a pre-professional program elsewhere. Otherwise, parents seemed not to be involved in the decision to apply, nor were high school teachers. In one instance a high school friend applied together with the respondent; otherwise friends were not involved. One respondent had a sister who had been in the first cycle of the Program, and this was the only instance in which an applicant had any information about the Program ahead of time other than what was offered in the letter.

REPARATION FOR THE PROGRAM

These four respondents came from varying secondary school backgrounds. Three attended public high schools, one a private school; three on the West Coast, one on the East Coast. The Program differed from anything students in most American high schools had ever experienced. The one student who had attended a "very academically sophisticated private school," and thought that the Program "was more similar to my high school experience than it would have been in a lower division lecture course," experienced no "culture shock" upon entering the program. The other three, however, reported having difficulty in adjusting to the demands of the Program. Said one respondent, "I was totally unprepared. I had suffered from being a person who needs to go to school in order to read the important books." Two others remembered having done well in high school, but meeting up with much more difficult standards in the Program. "Throughout my high school years I learned how easy it was just to use my natural intelligence to just skate by... You couldn't get away with that in the Program. And that's what you learn in the first year, this is not something you can approach in a superficial way. My first quarter here, I think I may have lost out; it took me awhile to really adjust." But the adjustment was made by the second quarter, and from the second quarter on, "it was the focus of my life here, this coursework.[1]"

---

[1] This preliminary study did not investigate in depth the secondary school experiences of respondents; this could be included in a subsequent, more extensive study.

Another student also reported being very confused the first semester;

> "I found it was scary, because I didn't know what was expected; I was a good student in high school and suddenly became aware that it didn't mean anything in the context of what was going on. I was confused and resistant...it was hard, a struggle. Learning to know what I didn't know."

Yet the valwe in such confusion should not be overlooked:

> "It was a humbling experience... it was just the experience itself that undercut the foundation which I had experienced before the Program...so that there was this long period of confusion that was not easy...but I had to come to terms with that, and that made me more receptive to things that came later. I could take them in, I didn't judge everything at first."

This last participant seems to be describing the acquisition of a specific state of mind, a "virtue" Tussman refers to as "docility, acquiescence, deference...a necessary element in the character of the healthy student" (ibid, p. 32). "Docile" comes from the Latin word docere, to teach, and perhaps this last quotation illustrates the benefits to learning in this student's words, of a "state of receptivity without prejudgment"--a state hardly encouraged by the atmosphere on the Berkeley campus in the late sixties.

In fact, the very use of the word "experimental" was the cause for some misunderstanding on the part of several applicants to the Program, according to one respondent. Because Berkeley was associated with radical ideas, "experimental" was thought to mean "radical", not just in the sense of departure from tradition, but in the sense of laissez-faire, or in the parlance of the time, "do your own thing." When these people discovered the clearly defined and settled structure of the Program which allowed no deviations, they rebelled and finding no support among faculty, eventually left. But, one senses, their leaving was not without protest, bitterness, and perhaps anguish all the way round. (Roughly one-third of the 150 students who began each cycle dropped out before completion of the Program, for whatever reasons.) The Program, clearly, was not for everyone. But for those who did stay the course there were rewards, as we shall see.

REACTION TO THE STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THE PROGRAM

The design of the Program was radical, of course, in the sense that it abandoned the traditional series of courses for lower-division students and substituted a program built around readings, lectures, seminars, writing, individual conferences and informal associations. The lectures, held twice a week for 1 1/2 hours, were to be attended by all students and all faculty members. The lecture series was coordinated with the readings, and its main function was "to stimulate and deepen the reading process." Rather than giving background or supplementary information, efforts were made to offer suggestive interpretations on what had been read, and "to sharpen and deepen the issues of problems latent in the reading." (ibid, p. 115) Sometimes one speaker lectured, sometimes two or three, and there were some panel discussions. This was a place for students to hear the views of the entire faculty, and to raise questions of their own. Perhaps since lectures were common to the whole undergraduate program, the lectures in the Program were not often mentioned by this group of respondents.

Tussman discusses the difficulties inherent in shifting from the usual course/lecture structure to lecturing with a group of colleagues throughout his book. One respondent testifies as to how the collaborative teaching in these lectures may have affected students:

> "There were these six guys, all there for the lectures, so it was for them a much different audience in a way...than if you are just running your own course...you've got people breathing down your neck and challenging you

> all the time... Now that I look back, I think a lot of it was over my head...they were talking to each other a lot of the time...they were interested in impressing each other... And so it was easy for things to go over our heads, because maybe they had more common language than we had, more than we were getting in the reading. [This was] coupled with our tendency toward rebellion, and our laziness, and other things that mitigated against our comprehending what was going on in the lectures."

Since the other respondents did not mention the lectures, one gets the impression they were not as important to the students as other features. By contrast, the seminars were mentioned frequently. The seminars, all required of all students, were attended by smaller groups of students, first fifteen in number, then eight, then ten or eleven. The purpose of the seminar was discussion of curricular materials and ideas in small groups. The seminars were held twice a week -- once with one faculty member, once without the faculty member present. This latter meeting came to be called the "unattended seminar", and was apparently one of the most successful features of the Program for these participants.

> "It was a very good experience in my memory because it really forced us to conduct seminars ourselves...it was great for skill strengthening... We began to learn how to lead seminars, how to figure out what kind of issues to grapple with..."

Even unobserved by faculty, students met the challenge: "The surprise was, how well they went. How you wouldn't really digress into talking about social activity. They did focus on course work." If students felt intimidated in lectures, and not able to ask questions or engage in discussions either there or in the regular seminar, they seemed to be freer in the unattended seminar: "It certainly gave a lot of students a chance to come up with their own ideas that perhaps they had not been able to get out in other seminars." Another former student became a habitue of the "unattended" seminar: "I liked it so much I attended other unattended seminars...because we used to develop friendships, bonds."

As part of the writing requirement, students were expected to keep a journal, to write a page or two each day, to develop some idea raised in a seminar or lecture or by the reading. The intent was to make the journal available for faculty scrutiny: if faculty availed themselves of that prerogative it was not as mentioned by any of the respondents. Fulfilling this requirement, away from the watchful eye of the faculty, was not as faithfully accomplished by this group of former students as was attending the "unattended" seminar. One respondent reports;

> "I kept a journal off and on. I would say I did maybe 35, 40% of the work expected. I would argue that I would prefer to spend the time talking with someone... It was time consuming, and I just didn't like to write. I don't remember going over the journals. I remember going over the papers, but the journals were always something in the background... there was no one really standing over you making you do this."

Another respondent says: "The journal was the least emphasized thing. I think there were very few students who really kept it properly. They would have had to give us some tools, some ways to develop that as a discipline, rather than just tell us to do it."

Some benefits of the Program were not to be recognized until later, however, and this was the case for one respondent for whom the journal was later to play a role almost certainly not envisioned by the designers of the program: "(The journal) was a seed...I struggled like everybody else did with it while I was here, and probably got serious the moment that I left, though I did keep a sporadic journal while I was here... It saved my life. I really attribute the reflection that I was able to generate to that, in taking me through a number of crises of a personal nature..."

Writing was expected to be a central part of the program. By the second cycle, students were expected to write about five formal papers each quarter, as well as daily journal writing. Professor Tussman considered the writing an activity "which reveals the mind at work and aids in the development of clarity, coherence, and understanding... a powerful pedagogic instrument" (ibid, p. 117). That emphasis is reflected in participants' comments. One felt that the biggest impact the Program had was through writing papers (and going to tutorials), and the discipline involved in both. "I think it was successful in its very good concentration on writing, skills, on learning to write clearly..." Another respondent had difficulty keeping the journal, and now says, "I can see now the value was that Joe wanted us to learn how to write as a discipline. Something you have to do as part of your education. And I certainly feel like I sort of missed the boat on that, not realizing that early on." And while one respondent from the second cycle reported: "It was helpful, because you wrote a lot and what you wrote was read and discussed," another respondent from the first cycle said about writing in the Program, "I don't recall getting much discipline... I think they could have scrutinized our prose a little more..."

These two contrasting comments perhaps reflected one difference between the first and second cycles in the manner in which student papers were reviewed by the faculty. During the first cycle, faculty comments and corrections were written on papers and returned to students; discussion of papers took place occasionally. In the winter quarter of 1968, when attrition had reduced the student/faculty ration to 20-1, the system was changed to regular semi-weekly individual tutorial sessions, devoted for the most part to analysis of students' written work. There was a rather unique aspect to these conferences -- faculty read their own copies of student papers for the first time during the conference or tutorial, together with the student rather than ahead of time. This procedure not only saved faculty time for first reading, it also allowed students to read their papers objectively for the first time as did the professor, commenting and questioning as he went. For one former student, mentioned earlier, writing papers and going to tutorials had the biggest impact of any feature of the Program and provided particular satisfaction. Another appreciated the unusual opportunity it offered:

> "There are so few freshmen in the University that ever have a chance to sit down with a faculty member and have his undivided attention for an hour -- much less do this every two weeks throughout an entire course, and have to be prepared when you come in with your paper [each time]."

There was another writing requirement, perhaps only in the first cycle, and not mentioned by Professor Tussman in his book. At the end of the first cycle, a respondent reports being asked to write an intellectual biography, but:

> "I think it was the wrong question at the wrong time. I don't think sophomores at the University of California at Berkeley in 1966, after all that was going on in both the culture at large and the community in general, were in the remotestly reasonable position to make that kind of assessment... I don't think developmentally you are, but certainly historically we weren't ... I don't think I would be able to write that paper until I was in my twilight years and the dust had really settled."

For that former student at least, the assignment was not successful, and one wonders if that was not the general agreement and the assignment then dropped. To have a kind of cognitive history of participants would indeed be valuable -- perhaps it was only the timing that was off, as this respondent suggests.

There is one feature of the Program, mentioned in the introduction, that was not academic in nature but of such basic importance to the carrying out of the whole venture it should be discussed more fully here. The house was the physical center of the Program. It provided faculty offices, seminar rooms, study hall, and commons room -- requiring the use of space outside the house only for the lectures, for which a larger room was needed than the house offered. The house is an attractive building, still in use by the University and now handsomely appointed, but during the years it was used by the Program there were no furnishings, rugs, or decoration aside from some tables, desks and folding chairs. Apparently there were mixed feelings among the students about the house, but the respondents in this study expressed no negative feelings about it. Quite the contrary, some felt the house played an important role in the integration of the Program in their student lives. One respondent says, "There was a hardcore group of friends in the Program that 'lived' here... we would have Sunday dinners here." Another participant said, "I spent a lot of time at the house, and did a lot of studying and reading here, and played the recorder in the big hall. There was an old typewriter, and long tables, and we would read and study there, listen to that old steam heater which used to clatter, and we had great, great times here."

At least for these respondents who all used the house, there was a feeling of community made possible by a common physical location that transcended the lack of physical attractiveness of the furnishings. One respondent says: "The greatest impact of the Program for me was the idea of a community of scholars, of having been associated with the same faculty members, the same students over two years with a physical location identified with this house here." The concept of community was of significance to participants: it was brought up spontaneously in all four interviews.

The house apparently had another function for students, that of defining groups within the Program. One respondent remembered that "There quite a few of us, quite a group, who hung out here, and there were those who didn't." That respondent would have liked the house to be residential, for everyone in the Program to have lived together. That was the ideal situation envisioned in the design of the Program, but not attempted. Given the differing views of the house and its use among participants, it would certainly be of value to have the views as well of other participants who did not "hang out" at the house.

Again, stressing the importance of community, one respondent contrasted the Program with "regular" education:

> "One major theme in comparing the Program to regular education is the sense of a community of scholars which you don't get in the regular university. There are just independent little classes, with no continuity from Spanish I to

> Spanish II. A completely new set of people, new instructor, so there's no continuity. In the Tussman Program there was the same faculty, same faces. You might change the people within your small seminars, from quarter to quarter, but they were people you were getting to know, and the same ideas and the same way of looking at things, approaching new topics over time that slowly built on that. The Program was something that built up to at the end of two years, something to really look back on, how your own thinking had evolved. You are looking at some of the basic questions confronting an individual in his role in society over two years, discussing this with the same people. You can temper this with your own personal growth at this time, the growth of your classmates."

This former student might have been prepared not only to write his own intellectual biography, but those of some of his classmates as well.

The social aspects of community was of great importance to some participants: "The main thing I remember was my peers, the social milieu...which was intellectually rich and quite exciting." Another reports, "At the time I felt very lucky because we had a built-in community...continuity, people we were relating to, and a lot of support during those first two years that just wouldn't be available to most undergraduates." A third is even more emphatic: "I don't think you can substitute community in any form...it was built into the Program, and that was a tremendous advantage, having opportunities to talk with people, know people, wrestle with issues, in a safe environment, in a place that's set up for dialogue and for wrestling with the great issues...it exposed us to a broader range of thought than we would naturally gravitate towards." It would seem then that the sense of community engineered by the Program had benefits extending beyond its intellectual content, but not out of keeping with its overall purpose, in allowing students to extend their new insights and understanding to contemporary social issues.

Questions were asked to solicit comments, along with those offered spontaneously, on the curriculum and intellectual content of the Program. Responses to the question "What did you think you were learning at the time?" were varied, and probably reflected not only differing degrees of understanding of the purpose of the program, but differing motivations as well. One student, who emphasized features of the structure of the Program, such as small classes, one-to-one contact with faculty, pass-fail grading more than the intellectual content, replied: "I probably didn't have a clue at the time... the classics...to appreciate the real monumental thinkers of the time." Another, to whom social relationships were of great importance: "About how people thought about things over these very different epochs, with greater depth." Others were more specific:

> "I think I was learning how to communicate with other people, your thoughts, the development of ideas. And to think critically and analytically, within the context of understanding who you are as an individual in this society, seeing challenges from everywhere and maintaining your sanity within all these challenges. Understanding where you are in time, in history, and how you are really no different from someone else 400 years ago, 2,000 years ago."

The same former student who reported moving from initial confusion to receptiveness to the ideas of the Program responded: "I was learning to know what I didn't know... I think I responded to what the intent of the Program was designed for, which was giving a sense of the rich cultural tradition...available in Western culture, and to value that."

Another respondent in describing the Program says:

> "Generally I would say we tried to lay a basic foundation for the philosophical thought development of western civilization, political civilization...the overall point being trying to produce people, voters who can think... and the only way to make an educated choice as a member of a democracy is to understand how this whole system has been put together."

This former student also saw the primary value of the Program to be

> "the development of the mind, learning how to look at issues, seeing how things we're looking at today can be viewed as what was going on in the Iliad thousands of years ago...that there

> is some sort of continuity to human experience no matter how different things may seem today, and the basic foundation of our Western thought is as valid now as it was thousands of years ago."

Continuity in the Program; continuity in culture: an intriguing parallel. Another respondent, echoing Professor Tussman's "conception of the community as enduring through time", reports:

> "Toward the end of the program I got this sense of a tradition that you could join... the belief that Tussman had in some kind of tradition which goes beyond the frantic moment...the belief that there is a saving remnant of people diligently working at the foundations of the polis and will pull us through."

The Program's contribution to helping participants learn to think more clearly and more critically was acknowledged by all four respondents. One acknowledged the benefit of learning to think critically and thought it was probably the aim of the Program. Another discussed other aspects of the Program as having the biggest impact:

> "There was a rule we weren't allowed to do outside research [and consult secondary sources], and I have come to think that was a very good rule. That we were really forced, in a way that most undergraduates are not, to think for ourselves even though there was a very strong bias in what we were reading, still the discipline to think for ourselves, and how that was followed through in the papers and the tutorials was a very good way of learning, was very challenging, very stimulating... I think the program was successful in its very good

> concentration on writing skills and learning to write clearly, and in trying to think clearly..."

And "the emphasis on thinking for ourselves...was tremendous" for influencing the student's capacity to study. "Because of the emphasis on thinking for ourselves and on digesting what we were reading, we were much less prone to coming up with what the professor wanted... we weren't having to give set answers, or just learn what they wanted us to learn, but we were really taught to integrate better and to think, and to relate things back and forth." Another respondent said, "You were forced to think, not just parrot back who did what..." It is clear from these statements and the following one that if "docility" was a desired trait in the incoming student, "docility" was meant to be interpreted as "teachable" rather than "submissive."

> "There's much less of that game that goes on in most academic things where you have to psyche out the professor and figure out where they're coming from and give them what they want to hear. You didn't have to do that in the Program, which was great."

Speaking of the Program's training in thinking skills is clear, one respondent says. "Beyond the basic core curriculum idea, there certainly was a working on students' minds in terms of trying to develop the mind as a resource, and I think it was successful in that." The concept of an intellectual community is introduced again in two further comments: "It did get a group of people to be able to think in a fairly logical, well thought-out way, and not just react to things, but actually sit down and analyze things." Another respondent reported being helped to learn through "thinking critically with a group of people, and about treating issues seriously." Discussions among students, both formally and informally, by themselves and with the guidance of faculty, seemed an important way of pursuing what Tussman described as the mission of the liberal arts college: that of cultivating human understanding with "the mind of the person, not the body of knowledge, [as] its central concern." (ibid, p. xiv.) The opportunity for the exchange of ideas and opinions that could take place in these groups must have been of central importance to the implementation of the purposes of the Program. It would have been difficult, if not impossible, for the Program to have had the same effect on students had they been only sitting in lectures, taking notes, writing papers and taking exams, with no opportunity to interact with faculty and fellow students.

In spite of the sixties' atmosphere of laissez-faire and "student power," some in the Program were able to appreciate the freedom that it actually offered them. One remarked that the way in which the Program had its biggest impact was through

> "its conception and structure, and its respect for the student...the educational structure with well-defined limits within which students experienced freedom...it was a great pattern for learning...the brilliance of the Program was that it had a series of set limits that were human, that recognized the limits of all parties involved and yet allowed a kind of exchange that was for me really important."

Two respondents actually mentioned the need for more structure. One felt "it was a little too loose...just not structured enough... I don't remember feeling scrutinized in a certain way." Another thought "I would have structured it a little more in certain areas, like having some written account come out of the unattended seminar."

Some respondents complained of the "narrowness" of the readings; one complained of "reading Hobbes and not Locke, and not reading Thomas Paine or anybody else counteracting the philosophy of the Federalist papers," apparently misunderstanding the intent of the Program design. Another, missing the deliberate ahistorical aspect of the Program, felt the Program was not successful in developing an historical perspective. While some students seemed to understand that an historical perspective was not intended to be part of the Program, and in fact would not be in keeping with its purpose, others either didn't understand from the beginning, or objected to its absence as the Program unfolded.

COMMENTS ON FACULTY

In a program this size, with a faculty/student ratio approaching 20 to 1, and with an emphasis on the tutorial and a close community, it is not surprising that the faculty had a strong impact on students. The collegiality among the faculty themselves was appreciated by students, and by contrast, when a sharp controversy developed during the second cycle between one faculty member and the others, it had a marked effect on students. Most of these respondents mentioned the episode, and a play was written and performed by students about it at the time. By comparison, in ordinary departments controversies between faculty members often go unnoticed by the undergraduates, or at least do not become issues of public debate.

The opportunity to get to know individual faculty members had a benefit for some students beyond the intellectual content of the Program. One respondent reported spending much time in dialogue with a particular faculty member over a contemporary political issue, and feeling grateful "that I wasn't just at loose trying to figure this all out by myself."

The opportunity for students to witness at first hand the dialogue among faculty about important issues was also a unique feature of the Program. "The main thing I remember about the Program was Jacobsen and Tussman in this sort of eloquent private biff over whether its the man and his human experience that should be understood, or if you should just look at the idea, like a symphony... that kind of discourse and the feeling of the real earnestness and authenticity of these two men as teachers and thinkers." The availability of faculty was also valued: "What stands out, I was in the seminar with Joe, that felt privileged. He was an extraordinarily charismatic intellectual and philosopher. Sitting around and talking with him was another highlight."

One respondent felt there was not enough disagreement among professors in the Program, not enough interdisciplinary variety, that every professor was coming to the Program with the same methodology and discipline and that that formed a very strong bias.

It is understandable that these young students, after signing up for an experimental program which might not have been described in the fullest detail, and which turned out to be quite rigorous and demanding in nature, might feel some ambivalence toward the Program and the faculty. "Even when I felt like I was mad at them, I was fighting what I thought of as the narrowness of it, I also felt privileged, even then, because there was a forum...and a content to deal with this rebellion." Another respondent put it this way: "I loved it and hated it... It was the sort of authoritarian arrogance, that's what we felt it was. That was what we interpreted the basic requirements to be, and the attitude we saw coming from some of the professors. But hate is an attachment, so that's not unsuccessful. I think you're unsuccessful when you don't touch the students you are trying to reach."

Not surprisingly, faculty members were not given equally high marks. One respondent said, "Joe was very charismatic and very inspiring, but I don't think everyone quite cut the mustard... There were some who just didn't get it all together...the material was clearly fertile soil, and I just don't know if it was always tilled expertly." Another felt the same faculty differed in their performance from the first year to the second: "They had a good first year with us, and then got lazy a little bit, didn't challenge themselves as much in terms of the content...it wasn't as strong and substantive."

The fact the Professor Tussman was the driving force behind the Program was not lost on students. One respondent, in discussing the sense of tradition he got from the Program, says "I attribute it mainly to Tussman's wiry sort of intelligent, insightful analysis of things, based on a philosophy and metaphor that is true, that is underlying part of what our Western culture has to offer us. Especially in the 60's we were at a juncture of trying to get back in touch with that. I believe he is in touch with that..."

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PROGRAM TO OTHER UNIVERSITY EXPERIENCE

There is no discussion in Tussman's book about what might be expected to happen when Program participants entered the regular university in their third year, and perhaps it was not the intention of the Program to concern itself with life after the Program. All four respondents in this survey did finish their undergraduate work at Berkeley, and some reported differing degrees of difficulty upon entering the upper division. The very continuity provided by six professors over a two year period in the Program was seen by one respondent as being in marked contrast to the two upper division years. The loss of Program faculty at the end of the second cycle was an artifact of the end of the Program on the campus, but the effects were felt nonetheless: "The Program really deserted us on that basis, because we couldn't use the professors for advisors in the third and forth years... so there was a real disadvantage in that we had no real relationships with professors." One suspects that an ideal faculty advising relationship had been established in the Program that could not be matched elsewhere in the University.

The experience in the Program not unexpectedly left its mark on participants as they entered regular university life. One respondent said, "I no longer had the capacity to study what I wasn't interested in. But if I were interested in something, I had the capabilities of writing about it, and discussing it. And I had confidence about my writing; it gave me a lot of skills to be able to function in the University."

Another participant chose an interdisciplinary major after the program and saw that as related to the concepts of the Program: "not being able to settle on any one discipline, not being comfortable with just one." Another respondent said that being in the Program changed his direction in the University, eliminated doing "just course work, just going into [a pre-professional field], and directed me to [a social science].

Another response to the Program for some students was to try to replicate some of its features in their upper division courses.

> "I got to so enjoying the small group mode that I sought that in the University... I chose history and English because they were general and involved reading and talking...out of the Program emerged a pattern of liking to read books that other people are reading and talking about."

That the articulation between the Program and the upper division was less than thorough can be seen in the response of one participant who said:

> "There is an inappropriateness to this kind of education; it's ivory tower, completely removed from the realities of not only your day to day existence, and your future career, it was completely inappropriate for the rest of your university days... it wasn't just smooth sailing... one of the first courses I took at the University, the first paper I had to write for that I thought was a very great paper, I thought I'd really evolved this idea very well, and really laid it down nicely. I got a C- on the paper [graded by a T.A.]."

Perhaps the feeling engendered by the experience in the Program of being special, part of an elite, together with the absence of grades during the two years of the Program, led some students to a somewhat unrealistic appraisal of their own abilities. This same former student said,

> "I felt I was doing something special, a member of almost an elite group of students, not that we were that way to begin with, but were developing into that... If anything, the Program encouraged you to think of yourself as being a little bit better than the average student, a little more successfully trained, educated, in some ways, probably gave people a slightly superior attitude in terms of their work."

That student may have suffered some loss of self-esteem when the academic self-image fostered in the Program did not match the letter grades in the upper-division. But despite the resulting let-down, that feeling of being something special had its advantages, too. This person went on to say, "When you enter the regular university actually that becomes of real value to you, because you have to have the attitude to be willing to break down anybody's door, because you're worth it to them. Whether its your teaching assistant or your professor, you've got to have this idea of your own self-worth if you're going to get anything out of the university other than just your degree."

It would be interesting to explore in more detail the development of that feeling of elitism or self-worth that the Program seemed to create in its participants. One former participant sheds some light on how this feeling might have been fostered. "I got THAT kind of respect at THAT age, just stepping out away from the family. I got RECOGNITION with other students; I was being spoken to directly about good words, great books."

This feeling of elitism was pervasive; all four participants mentioned it spontaneously in one form or another. Some actually believed they were hand-picked to begin with: "The people who came into the Tussman program got screened on some basis, I'm not sure what... I think it was a particularly juicy bunch... I think you had to have a B average... a little better cut than just the average freshman." (In fact it was true that Program participants had to have satisfied the Subject A requirement. Other than that, there was no selection of applicants--names were pulled at random from a hat, or two hats actually, one for men and one for women.) Another participant reported: "I believed that what we were doing was making me into something that was special... I became a Tussmanite." A third said, "I felt so lucky to be in the Tussman Program... most people out there were lost or just being put through drone introductory courses..." A fourth: "I felt privileged... I felt lucky, real lucky..."

The feeling of elitism was so entrenched that one respondent reported surprise when a group met for a reunion recently and some discovered, or rediscovered that they had been chosen at random, rather than for special qualities. As one respondent put it, "We were set apart from the University... There was a kind of snobbery aspect because we were so special...you sort of need to feel that you're different, there's a need to feel and identify with the kind of group consciousness... you are looking for groups to identify with." And so, in a developmental sense, the Program also apparently met for some students the need to identify with an institution, a connection that must be difficult for many students in a university the size of U.C., Berkeley. It is an interesting hypothesis that association with the Program, or even a specific small group within the Program based on an intellectual style, could serve the same function as membership in a chess club or basketball team. For some students the Program was certainly a home, and probably like home never was. It could well be that the Program, together with its house, served as a transition between the diminishing dependence of adolescence and the emerging independence of young adults.

THE EFFECT OF THE PROGRAM ON CAREERS AND CONTINUING ACADEMIC LIFE

All four of these respondents went on to do graduate work, some in purely academic fields, some in professional fields. One student felt the experience of being in the Program to be a mixed blessing; on the one hand, being encouraged to think things out on their own was an advantage, but a habit of not relying on secondary sources led this student to have trouble writing a thesis where this was the expectation in graduate school.

One former student felt the Program had drawbacks for people interested in fields requiring pre-professional training but that it offered something quite different in its place: "It set up a mode for me that I wanted to complete, wanted to stay with, and it related to some interior development; it did not relate to making it in the world." Another in the same vein: "for people coming to a university with any sort of goal orientation towards a career, it was really not appropriate. It was liberal arts education at its best, and probably at its most remote from the real world, with the possible exception of people going into the legal profession". And perhaps the strongest reaction: "I could say...[that] my first two years were wasted in terms of career development, in terms of increasing my worth in the market place... I don't think any of the faculty would have objected to that; their idea was not in creating something marketable, but in developing your mind."

One senses from these contrasting reactions to the absence from the Program of any kind of introduction to the professional world, that there might have been a difference in its appropriateness for students who differed in their willingness to delay the start of their careers. One resists the idea that such a rich intellectual experience could not be taken advantage of by any freshman qualified for entrance to U.C., Berkeley. But perhaps some students need a tangible vocational goal to motivate them and give direction to their studies right from the start of university life. Perhaps offering something like the Experimental College to students at another time in their academic career could be considered. And the notion of a version of the Program offered through extension intrigues.

It was not always possible for respondents to pinpoint the exact effect of the Program on subsequent academic work and careers. One puts it this way: "It was mostly through the people I met, rather than the content... but maybe there was something mysterious about the Program which made me more inquisitive in some ways than I might have been." This respondent went on to describe taking part in intellectual discussions for years after the Program was over, continuing an education begun then but "spanning many, many years," with the program providing intellectual "ballast."

Another respondent said; [The sense of tradition] was a very powerful psychological line, and I have a great respect for it, because it still guides me now... Another powerful metaphor which was used often was the cave analogy of Plato. Once you've worked your way out of the cave of appearances and you apprehend your reality directly, it's incumbent that you go back in and talk about it..." That person subsequently incorporated some of the educational structure admired in the program to the teaching of young children. Still another respondent, when asked if anything in the Program had been important in later life, answered: "I feel the foundation...in law and the nature of government, of society, of man, is all useful. I didn't go along with it in the form that we got it, but the questions are still THE questions."

Another consequence somewhat tangential to the content of the Program was reported by another participant who also formed lasting friendships there and whose subsequent career choice developed from contacts made through the Program, and that choice in turn "changed my life... It was a way of responding in some ways to the issues that were being raised: 'what was our responsibility as citizens?'" In this case, and another where the career choices were not academic, one senses an influence of the spirit of the Program nevertheless. This second person finally chose a career "in service to the community, atoning for having been unrealistic and [first] choosing a career without a real purpose."

Sometimes, among some respondents, there seems to be a wistfulness about not having pursued the academic life, or at least not having fulfilled some supposed goals of the faculty. "It [the Program] did not train me to be a platonic scholar. It did not succeed with me philosophically. I did not come out in a rational place..." And yet from this same person: "I'm very grateful. I feel like it was a great opportunity and privilege to go deep, and to be able to have support to do that."

From another: "I think I ended up feeling less of a bigwig intellectual... I just didn't get into it in a certain way that I certainly felt from Jacobsen and

Tussman or even some of the other kids... My heart wasn't into it... I felt less deep... I just wasn't ready."

Given the range of chronological and developmental ages of entering freshmen to the University, it is not surprising that some students, no matter how intelligent or successful in high school, felt themselves to be "not ready" for the Program in its full intellectual and philosophical scope. And yet one cannot deny, after reading these comments of former students looking back over a twenty year span, that the Program did have great impact on them, and stirred them in ways that may not yet all be realized.

THE SETTING: BERKELEY IN THE SIXTIES

As mentioned at the beginning of this report, and as everyone knows, the socio/political setting on the Berkeley campus in the late sixties was a particularly unusual one, and is entwined in the stories of each of these four respondents. Exactly how that affected participation in the Program is not within the scope of this study, except to mention again that some students enrolled in the Program believed that the term "experimental" referred to the amount of freedom they would have in designing their own curriculum. When faced with the exact opposite, a curriculum prescribed in detail from which there was no deviation, some of these students retreated. But one respondent reacted differently: "It was a good coherent package presented. When you agreed to sign on, all those agreements were very clearly stated at the beginning. All the goals and all of the requirements were stated upfront, and there was no deviation from the purity of it." At the very least, the question of authority loomed large at the time, and it could be said the success of this program, authoritative in style if not authoritarian, is remarkable.

One respondent described Berkeley in 1965 as an intellectual frontier, where students were doing something that had never been done before,

> "so the elders didn't have a lot to say to us... there was a real sense of great power in the streets and amongst us... There was a sense of an enormous unknown, that it was not going to be like anyone else's future, that we were never going to get old, that we didn't think seriously about having to work... that we could make it anyway we wanted to and wouldn't make the same mistakes... it was a kind of headiness... it was alienating, not something that could be talked about, and became a source of a kind of schism of generations. It emboldened us to think that we didn't have to be as deferential."

The fact that the current happenings in the world and on campus were not permitted to become part of the curriculum was frustrating for some. One former student, while recalling fighting and rebelling against this, now recognizes the "stimulating" effect of this conflict: "It gave me something to fight against, and that was a good thing because it provided a focal point for my own rebellion, a place for me to sort out the issues."

Nothing could better illustrate the idiosyncratic nature of the students' response to these limits than the memories of another student, from the same years, who saw the classical background, the Trojan wars and the content of the Program relating to just what was happening on the campus. "You couldn't help but having those basic metaphors to start talking with...when they took over Moses Hall, and overturned trash cans and set bonfires around the Campanile, it became for us the metaphor. We had been reading Milton and Paradise Lost, and this was Milton's Hell, people having philosophical debates around fires, in the middle of the night with the old Berkeley buildings reflecting firelight, and this odd smell...." In face of the seductiveness to the students of the sense of their own power to change the world around them as the rest of the world watched on television, one wonders at the ability of the Program, its principals and its faculty, to appeal to students, and to achieve so many of its goals.

FURTHER RESEARCH

The value of a retrospective evaluation of the Program may seen obvious -- nineteen or twenty year olds of course lack the maturity of people approaching 40 to weigh and measure their earlier experiences, particularly in such turbulent times as those of Berkeley in the late 60's. Young people just beginning to break away from home physically and psychologically are bound to see their interactions with faculty, now serving to some degree as parental substitutes, colored by that conflict. Twenty years later, having either resolved that conflict or grown away from it, these respondents have surely answered some of the questions posed by the interview differently from what they would have said immediately after the end of the Program.

It is for this reason that the time seems ripe to begin a more thorough investigation of the Program. The information gleaned from these four interviews represent a fraction of what might be found from more extensive interviewing with more Program alumni. With thirty or so respondents, one could explore a broader diversity of responses to the Program, and be able to make some rough estimates of the distribution of responses, (i.e.,) which were common, and which rare or unique. Indeed, that number of interviews would even allow some distinctions to be made among the respondents in the sample, for example on the basis of subsequent academic or professional success, and make it possible to learn something of the varying effects of the Program on different kinds of students.

This report offers a framework for organizing and reporting the data from the interviews. New themes may well emerge from further interviewing, but it should not be difficult to integrate data from additional interviews into this analysis.

On the basis of these first four interviews, it is expected that another thirty alumni can be found who will be willing and indeed eager to talk of their experiences with the Program. These interviews demonstrate the vividness of recall possible, perhaps because of the unusual intensity of this undergraduate experience. An additional thirty interviews, spread out over the two cycles, and ideally involving equal numbers of men and women, would offer a firmer basis for generalizations and insights useful to the continuing discussion of curricular reform.

Experimental College Program

Interview Questions

What year did you enter, and how long were you in the Program?

Did you graduate from Berkeley? When? Major?

Graduate work?

Could you describe the Program and its content briefly?

Did you do the journal?

Unattended seminar?

What other courses did you take outside the Program? How did they compare with the courses in the Program?

What part of the Program had the biggest impact on you?

How successful was the Program for you that first year? 2nd?

How did you feel about your education in relationship to other UC,B freshmen not in the Program?

Did you find the curriculum challenging? Stressful? Successful in meeting its goals as you understood them?

What did you feel you were learning at the time?

How did your experiences in the Program effect the rest of your college career? Did it have any bearing on your choice of major? Capacity to study? Ability to write? Think critically?

Have any of what you studied in the program been important to you in later life?

Did participation in the Program help you to grow in any way?

Do you think it might have changed the course of your life in any way, intellectually, professionally, personally?

What is your overall judgment now about your satisfaction with the Program?

Have you had continuing contact with your fellow students from the Program? With faculty?

What features of the Program did you feel were the least successful?

Anything you would have changed?

If you were to design a similar program, how would you go about it--what would it include?

Turning to the non-academic side of the Program, did you find you were making good friends there with other participants?
With others in the program?

Where did you live?

Where did you spend most of your time? Did you spend much time in the building outside of classes?

Did you really identify yourself with the ECP, or Tussmann college, or just use its facilities?

Looking back, do you remember how you first heard about the Program?
What was it about the Program that attracted you?
What led you to enter the Program? What did you hope to get out of it?
What was your alternative to not being accepted?

How did your parents feel about the Program? High school teachers? Friends?

Did you know others who were applying? Were they accepted? Did they go?

Did you enjoy your years in the program? Do you have any regrets?

Do you have anything you want to add?

Are there any other questions you think I should be asking?

Do you know of other program participants in the area I might call for an interview?

What did you think of the interview?

Appendix B

Katherine Trow

The Experimental College Program at Berkeley: Long Term Effects of an Experiment in Undergraduate Education

Occasional Paper #73

Center for Studies in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

January 1991

Occasional Paper #73

THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE PROGRAM AT BERKELEY: LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF AN EXPERIMENT IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Katherine Trow

January 1991

Revised paper presented at the annual Meeting of the Project Directors, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Washington, D.C., October 18, 1990.

Mrs. Trow is Project Director of the Experimental College Study, conducted at the Center and supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

Center for Studies in Higher Education, South Hall Annex
University of California, Berkeley, California 94720

The story of the Experimental College Program at Berkeley in the late sixties really begins at the University of Wisconsin in the twenties with the founding of the Experimental College by Alexander Meiklejohn, a professor of philosophy and previously president of Amherst College. Joseph Tussman, who was later to become a professor of philosophy and chairman of the department at Berkeley, was a student of Meiklejohn's in the thirties, and carried with him Meiklejohn's vision of a radically different approach to undergraduate education, which Tussman was then able to replicate, with some modifications, at Berkeley, beginning in 1965.

As is commonly known, other radical educational alterations were also taking place at Berkeley at that time, beginning with the Free Speech Movement in the fall of 1964. Contrary to the beliefs of many people on the campus at the time, and of many to this day, the impetus behind the founding of the Experimental College Program, or Tussman College as it came to be called, was in no way connected with the Free Speech Movement, as were other educational experiments at Berkeley, such as the Strawberry Creek College. Actually, Professor Tussman began negotiations with the Administration and the Academic Senate at Berkeley in the spring of 1964. That concurrence of events probably led, as Professor Tussman has stated, to an easier acceptance of his proposal by the Administration and by the Academic Senate at a time of heightened interest in and commitment to educational reforms (Tussman, 1969). It also led to a natural misunderstanding on the part of many interested students who confused the term "experimental" in the Program's title with "alternative," or "do-your-own-thing," which became one of the popular educational slogans at the time. In actuality, the Experimental College Program could not have been further from a "do-your-own-thing" approach to lower division education (that is to say, the first two undergraduate years), although it certainly would have been considered a radical approach at any time or place in the history of American higher education.

The Program enrolled 150 students, half of them women, half men. There were no courses. There were no classes. There were no examinations, and no grades. Instead of the usual assortment of unrelated freshman and sophomore courses, the curriculum focussed on times of cultural crisis throughout history, beginning with Greece at the time of the Peloponnesian Wars, and readings which included the Iliad and the Odyssey, to seventeenth-century England and Paradise Lost and Hobbes' Leviathan, to eighteenth-century America with the Federalist Papers, then Henry Adams, and U.S. Supreme Court decisions, and ending with Marx, Freud, and the autobiographies of Lincoln Steffens and Malcolm X. According to Tussman, his was not a course in either "Western Civilization" or "Great Books," although it resembled them. The Program was instead about "Great Problems" throughout history--periods which produced "a rich and varied literature in which powerful minds grappled with fundamental human problems" (Tussman, 1969).

The format was set, the curriculum was set, and there were to be no changes, although there was some haggling about readings during the last part of the second year. There was no place in the Program's design for students to make up their own programs or course contents, as became commonplace at Berkeley following the FSM revolution.

In place of four or five faculty members who may never have even met each other lecturing in four or five unrelated courses which changed each quarter or semester or year, there were five faculty members for the whole group of 150 admitted students. These five professors (assisted by five teaching assistants the first year) worked with these students over the entire two-year period. This worked out to a student/faculty ratio of about 25:1, consistent with the rest of the University, and therefore no more expensive. The faculty taught not in large lectures held in huge auditoriums, where sometimes, according to students at Berkeley, they could hardly see the lecturer, but in lectures for the whole Program group (including all the faculty); in smaller seminars of ten to fifteen students; in one-to-one tutorials; and in numerous informal encounters. Instead of moving from building to building around the campus, students gathered for all Program activities in a former fraternity house on the edge of the campus, which had recently been purchased by the University and turned over to the Program. Students were encouraged to study there, play music, and congregate for academic and social purposes. Many, although not all, students took advantage of this, and there was much informal contact among students, and between faculty and students, at the house.

Instead of examinations and grades, the faculty kept track of student progress by the assignment of a paper every week or two, dealing with material from the readings. Sometime after the start of the Program, Professor Tussman devised an unusual method of reading student papers. Students were asked not to submit papers ahead of time for professors to read and write comments, but to bring two copies of their papers to tutorials where the professor and the student would read them together. Students were also asked to keep a journal of their thoughts about and reactions to the readings, the lectures, seminars, and discussions which could be used in writing papers, in seminar discussions, and tutorials.

Unlike any sequence of courses a lower-division student might choose to take, there was a purpose to the curriculum. That was the development in students of what Tussman called a "political vocation," that is, the education of students for responsible citizenship. It was a "moral" education, and the interrelated themes of freedom and responsibility ran throughout the curriculum.

This Program was not, as might be assumed from the reading list, an elitist honors program. Letters inviting students to apply were sent to all entering freshmen. About 325 entering freshmen applied for places in the first two-year cycle of the Program beginning in the fall of 1965. They represented approximately 10 percent of that year's entering class. Seventy-five names were drawn from each of two hats, one for women applicants and one for men. (There are no surviving records, but it is believed that somewhat greater numbers of women applied than men.) Of those 150 entering students, approximately one-third dropped out over the course of the next two years, most of them during or at the end of the first year. This was apparently true for both two-year cycles. Many of the early drop-outs were students who had assumed "experimental" meant "laissez-faire," and once they discovered that it did not, left the Program to return to the regular University lower division program.

At the end of the first year of the first cycle, the five teaching assistants were replaced by an additional faculty member. Each of these professors in the first cycle had been recruited by Professor Tussman from faculty members already teaching on the Berkeley campus, and already having earned tenure. Professor Tussman knew them all (or thought he knew them); they all had reputations as outstanding teachers. However, conflicts arose almost immediately--mostly between one or two faculty members and Professor Tussman. Some of these were quite serious. Before the beginning of the second cycle in the fall of 1967, as the original faculty returned to their departments, Tussman changed recruiting practices and found five other new professors. These men had for the most part been students and friends of his and now had regular teaching positions in other colleges and universities. They came to Berkeley as temporary visiting lecturers or professors.

This new recruiting procedure resulted in fewer conflicts among faculty, and between faculty and Tussman. But it did not solve the problem of staffing the Program in the long term. First cycle faculty were unable to take more than one or two years away from their teaching, research and departmental responsibilities. This was true of second cycle faculty as well; in addition, those men did not have tenure and there was no apparent way to find tenure positions at Berkeley for a program that was not a department. Professor Tussman has said he would have continued the Program on a permanent basis if the tenure problem could have been solved (Tussman, 1988). When he was informed by a vice-president of the University finally that tenure positions could not be found (in spite of the interest of the Chancellor in continuing the Program), Professor Tussman did not argue. There was no third cycle.

It would be wrong, however, to think that that was the last of the Experimental College Program. Other programs modeled after it were tried at San Jose State University in the late sixties, and at Evergreen State College in the state of Washington. That program led to the formation of the Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education, a statewide consortium devoted to improving undergraduate education, emphasizing both faculty and curriculum development (Gabelnick, et al., 1990). And Malaspina College in Canada has recently proposed a two-year degree-completing program in conjunction with the University of Victoria which is modeled in large part after the Tussman program (Bauslaugh, 1990). And so the Tussman and Mieklejohn Programs are replicable and adaptable today.

But what of the "Experiment at Berkeley" itself? What traces are left? What is to be learned from the four years of intensive, time consuming, and often wearying efforts of Professor Tussman and his colleagues? And what of the 200 or so participants who "graduated" from the Program? What differences has the Program made in their lives? If ever such an experiment deserved a follow-up study it would seem to be the Experimental College Program at Berkeley. The former participants are now some twenty years older than when they studied in the Program and can look at the Program from the vantage point of greater maturity. Do they remember their years in the Program, their experiences, thoughts, feelings at the time and what do they mean to them now? How do they view the Program and its effects on their lives now?

These were the thoughts that I had while listening, five years ago, to Professor Tussman describe his Program to a Seminar at the Center for Studies in Higher Education on the Berkeley campus, a description he was only able to begin in the two hours allotted to him. Subsequent conversations with Tussman revealed that although there had been a study done aimed at comparing the personality development of students in the first cycle with that of students in the regular undergraduate program (Suczek, 1972), there had been no real follow-up study of the Program.

Tussman was happy to talk to me about the Program, in great length and in detail; to open his files to me; and to lend his support to a follow-up study. He provided me with a list of names of former participants who he knew still lived in the Bay Area, two men and two women--one from the first cycle and three from the second. They were all willing to talk with me, and I discovered through this trial run that they all had memories of the Program, sometimes quite detailed and vivid. Furthermore, they had opinions of the effectiveness of various components of the Program, and how they had affected their lives at the time and since their participation in the Program. Although there were only four respondents in this pilot study, the interviews produced a great deal of information and insight into the workings of the Program; how it fit in with that very special time on the Berkeley campus; what the Program meant to them educationally and personally; and whether and to what degree they felt it was worthwhile.

On the basis of these first four interviews I felt a larger study was more than feasible, would allow for comparisons to be made between first and second cycles, between men and women, and would help to inform the periodic controversies about curricular reform which all too often are based on folklore or passionate conviction rather than research. A study of this kind could lead to a better understanding of what kinds of curricular, organizational and pedagogical arrangements have the most lasting effects on college and university education. There was a challenge here to learn from the former participants in the Program how we might achieve its considerable success today, perhaps on a broader scale, while avoiding the pitfalls that Professor Tussman has charted for us.

There is a small tradition of long-range studies of the effects of higher education. Theodore Newcombe did a follow-up study in the early fifties of Bennington students he surveyed in the thirties (Newcombe, 1943). An eight-year follow-up survey of students who attended CUNY-Buffalo deals mainly with satisfaction in a number of different current life situations (Hoekle, 1977). And Benson Snyder has been interviewing former MIT students whom he had studied in the sixties (Snyder, 1971). Whatever their other merits, none of these studies were directed at assesment of the long-term effects of programs of curricular reform.

A grant from FIPSE allowed me to expand the study to include a total of 40 interviews. In the spring of 1989, I began interviewing 36 additional respondents. Interviewing was completed by the end of 1989.

Using lists of Program students from the files, the Alumni Records Office on the campus supplied addresses from their lists. From these lists I selected people with addresses in the greater San Francisco Bay Area. Letters were sent inviting them to participate in the study and explaining conditions of confidentiality--each respondent received a code number which was available only to me, and all interviews and information about respondents were held in confidence. The final selection of interviewees consisted of 20 people from each of the two two-year cycles, divided equally between men and women. Follow-up phone calls were then made to the people who had been sent letters.*

Interviews lasted from just short of an hour to almost four hours. Several interviews had to be done in two sessions as respondents ran out of time but wanted to continue. The average interview lasted about two hours. They took place on the campus in an office (quite coincidentally in the old Program house, which is now the Graduate School for Public Policy); in the offices and shops of correspondents; in restaurants; in their homes; in mine. They were recorded on a tape cassette and transcriptions were made of these tapes. A list of 55 open-ended questions about their experiences in the Program and attitudes toward it was used as a guide; however, many respondents spoke freely and at length before the first questions could even be asked. While there were many common themes running throughout the interviews, each offered a unique glimpse into the meaning of the Program for its participants and were not repetitious in any sense.

In order to make some judgment about the uniqueness of this group of former Program participants compared with other Berkeley students, a questionnaire was compiled to include brief demographic data--age, gender, religious background, etc.--and included questions on attitudes toward college education taken from the nationwide survey of entering freshmen from 1966 to 1967 conducted by the American Council on Education. That data has yet to be fully analyzed, but a review reveals no important differences that would make the study group special or different in most respects from other groups of entering freshmen at Berkeley.

---

*Of this group, only one person refused to be interviewed--she demurred on the basis of time, and assured me that her feeling about the Program was not what was preventing her from being interviewed. And most poignantly, one woman, being treated for cancer, wanted to do the interview in spite of loss of strength, because of her strong positive feelings about the Program. Unfortunately, that interview could not be arranged.

Preliminary analysis of the interviews has produced a wealth of findings in a number of different areas. Perhaps the most immediately visible finding was that 37 of the 40 people interviewed said they would "do the Program again." Whether these people interviewed are representative of the 200 participants who finished the Program cannot be determined conclusively, yet questionnaires using 18 questions from the interview schedule sent to an additional group of 17 Program participants who lived outside the San Francisco Bay Area and could not be interviewed for the project revealed roughly the same distribution as those who were interviewed: all but one of the 17 said they would also repeat the Program.

But probably the most important single finding was that twenty years later, former participants could remember details and assess the overall impact of the Program on their lives. They did not always remember well each component of the Program, but they did remember how they felt about the Program and its various features. Another major finding, substantive but equally important, has to do with the value of diversity in the many Program components. With respect to the curriculum, many respondents remembered reading the Greeks to be the highlight of the Program; others talked glowingly of Hobbes' Leviathan; many seemed still to be awed at having read the Bible as literature. Even though each selection was not universally popular--some people mentioned having trouble struggling through some of these readings--the readings as a whole were given high marks by almost all respondents.

As to the structure, not everyone thought the lectures were the best or among the best features of the Program--but many did. And the same was true for the small seminars with faculty members present, as well as for what were called the "unattended seminars," where students met in small groups without a professor. But almost everyone spoke enthusiastically about at least one of these features.

The same diversity applied to faculty. When some respondents judged one or two professors to be ineffectual, they also found others who reached them, and whose comments and criticisms of their writings were extremely important to them. In the design and structure of the Program, there truly was something for everyone.

In addition, there are other themes worth mentioning here. These can be grouped under six broad headings:

First, the findings tell us what the biggest impact of the Program has been for these participants, its other rewards and benefits, and what they thought they were learning at the time. They tell us if that has changed or remained constant.

Second, they talk about changes they would make in the Program, if they would make any changes at all, for respondents were not uncritical of some aspects of the Program.

Third, they talk about the educational impact of the Program at the time, how it made them aware of educational issues and how in many cases it gave them a sense of self-determination in their academic careers. Many report feeling part of an "elite," although most of them knew all along they had been chosen randomly. They talk about the transition from the Program to the upper division in the "Big U," as the regular university was called. They speak of the effect of the Program on their writing, reasoning and other academic skills; about the effect on later academic careers, on jobs and careers and attitudes toward them.

Fourth, they tell us about what attracted them to the Program in the first place, (in general, the small size and increased faculty contact).

Fifth, we learn how their high schools prepared them or failed to prepare them for the Program and for collegiate work in general. (For the most part, high school preparatation was not particularly relevant to success in the Program. Respondents often did report, however, that they wish they had had training in seminar participation in high school.)

Sixth, they give us their opinions of the many facets of the Program as they experienced it: the faculty, the lectures and seminars, the curriculum, the papers and the journal, and so forth, and tell us how they felt about the House. (Almost to a person, whether they used it frequently or not, they felt the House was an extremely important, positive aspect of the Program and contributed to the sense of community engendered by the Program.) They tell us how they reacted to having no grades (sometimes unsettling, but usually freeing, allowing them to concentrate on what they were learning rather than on earning grades.)

These are only some of the findings of the Study. These and others will be discussed more fully in the final report.

Implications for educational practice, not only for special self-contained programs such as these but for undergraduate education generally, can be drawn from the findings. Here I would like to mention four such areas. First, the focus of the Program away from examinations and grades and toward their own intellectual development as indicated in their papers and discussions led many students to a feeling of "empowerment," in the sense that professors listened to them and cared about what they were saying and writing. The fact that the students themselves were commenting on primary sources contributed to that feeling of efficacy. Surprisingly, people who described themselves as somewhat "slow learners" or "slow readers" found the pace and format of the Program compatible with their needs, and they profited from the Program in a way they believe they would not have in regular lower division courses.

Second, a program such as this designed along authoritative lines gave rise to a feeling of relief on the part of many respondents--a sense that all the hard decisions about curriculum and instruction had been made for them and they were happy with that. By contrast, the frustration or disappointment of others with this aspect of the Program led many to drop out. When it became "politically incorrect" for some students to remain in the Program, it took a personal and developmental sense of ease with authority for them to accept the Program's "dogma." The fact that the Program had a kind of hidden agenda, both in the sense of its purpose, that of "political vocation," and pedagogically, in the sense of leading students, through discussions of their writings, to higher levels of intellectual development, led several students to the suspicion that they were being indoctrinated somehow, being asked to accept the "Program line." That the Program was for 18- to 20-year-olds, at an age of separation from parental authority both physical and psychological, meant that many students transferred such rebellious or dependent feelings (or both) from parents to the Program faculty members, who were available and accessible to them in ways distant figures lecturing from a stage were not. And if that were not challenge enough, the Program took place, as we have noted, at a time of intense hostility toward adults in authority on the Berkeley campus (Heirich, 1971). That the Program managed to retain two-thirds of its original entering student body was an accomplishment of no small measure.

Third, while men and women responded alike in many ways to questions about the Program's impact, there were some interesting differences. The first clear difference to emerge was that men talked more than women--their tapes and transcripts were about one-third longer, and that was equally true for both cycles. Also half of the women in the first cycle talked of wishing for more and closer faculty contacts. Apparently they were shyer than men about seeking them out, even though the faculty were available, or perhaps those contacts simply mattered more to women, as the report of the Harvard Educational Seminars points out (Light, 1990.) Whether these gender differences would hold true for a similar program today remains an open question. More women than men remarked that they thought they would profit more from participation in such a program at this time in their lives, rather than earlier when developmental demands of late adolescence often left them confused, or dictated more attention to their social rather than academic lives.

And fourth and last, although the Program began at a time before very much attention was being paid on the campus to racial and ethnic considerations, it did attract minority students. Four of them were included among the group of respondents: two men and two women, all from the first cycle--two Asians, one black, one Hispanic. These four respondents did not differ from non-minority respondents in their reactions to the Program in any discernible ways, and when asked, each replied that race or ethnicity were never issues for them in the Program. One of these participants was particularly enthusiastic and emphatic about what he had gained from the Program and the lasting influence it had. He was one of the very strongest and most involved supporters of the Program in the group I interviewed.

These are only some of the many educational issues raised by the study. These and other considerations for educational policy as well as curricular reform will be discussed more fully in the final report.

To give a better sense of these interviews, I would like to finish by quoting directly from some of the interviews themselves.

The following are some responses (given now some 20 years after leaving the Program) to the questions about what the biggest impact the Program had had on their lives; about what participants had been getting out of it at the time; and about what they thought they were learning. The first group are from men from the first cycle.

> "What I was getting out of it was the sense that I was a person within this large student learning institution, as opposed to a number someplace. The people knew me and recognized me and therefore had some degree of caring, knew your work and could comment directly, speak to you directly....If you were ill or something in the Tussman Program, people knew it; if you didn't show up for a couple of days...they would ask, 'How are you? Were you ill?'"

The same respondent talking about the curriculum:

> "[I would have said I was] studying the classics more than anything else....I was learning and trying to get some appreciation for why people had so much respect and awe for some of these people that I had read so much about...some of the great authors--Plato's theories of The Republic, what it all meant to be in a democracy...I got a real appreciation for that which I could not have had in a large class. Just because of the interaction and the exchange of ideas. We were reading about Plato's Republic and we were indeed acting like one...."

A minority student, mentioned earlier, who had come to Berkeley on scholarships, says this about the major impact of the Program on his life:

> "I would say that my drive for more education...was strongly pushed forward by participation in the Tussman Program. I went on to get my master's and my doctorate, and I lay a lot of that to the support and the motivators that I had working with me in the Program....The Tussman Program pretty much defined my life the two years I was in it, in terms of social, organizational, and political relationships. So it was in a sense, a very large extended family."

Even the few who said they would not repeat the Program had some things to say about its positive, long-lasting effects. One man says:

> "Maybe I listen a little bit better than I would have, maybe I'm willing to admit to the relevance...to the correctness of somebody who approaches things completely differently....I feel that participation in the Program gave me a sense of the value of great literature for its own sake. It gave me a sense of the importance of the recurrence of great ideas."

Many respondents mentioned the delayed effects of the Program, coming to realize the consequences of the Program in their lives only after some time had passed:

> "You understand something better when you understand the relationships of knowledge across disciplines as opposed to in isolation. I'm not sure I would have articulated it that way then, but I'm sure that's a benefit that I got because I think I began to see it better later on."

That the Program was not just about knowledge, or academic skills, became clear to this man:

> "What I remember is sort of an attitude that those guys had: 'Think for yourself and you can probably do what you want to with your life.' I mean I get this feeling that a lot of what Joe was thinking about had to do with how students develop. I don't think it was just education [in the usual sense], it was sort of a lifestyle. I feel that that place generated that. The informality of the thing. The big group meetings. The first name approach to everybody. I think that was a whole package...."

There were some comments about learning from women in that first cycle. One said:

> "It (the Program) created an awareness and a real sensitivity to what I feel learning is about....It was rounded, it was integrated in a lot of ways. There were different aspects of learning that were included....I think that the Program affected me a lot in general--in my life, just the way I think, just the way I look at the world, in terms of what freedom is about. And then my choice of being a teacher....
>
> I think my ideal way of being at a university is what I think of as the Tussman Program....Actually, I didn't ever think of that before, but it's just people discussing things and getting all excited about them, and ideas. I just think that was fantastic. And even though I was very shy and didn't participate, I was very excited by all the discussion, about all the different things that were going on. And that's what I think learning is, that's the best kind of learning there is....All the ways that I'd been taught about learning before were people telling me what to do. You can learn some things from [that] but I think that the real learning that goes on is within a context of a lot of freedom...."

And this comment described a highly constrained and defined curricular program. What a different concept of "freedom," particularly for Berkeley in the sixties!

Another woman expresses the importance to her of using primary sources:

> "I think the major impact that I felt from the Program that led me to want to set aside enough time to even talk to you about it, was the fact that I think it was a terrific advantage that we were taught from primary sources rather then secondary sources. Rather than reading what somebody else thought about Euripides you actually sat down and read it first and thought about it yourself....I think it makes a much better approach to education, to first actually read material, think about it, put it together with other material, before someone who is a scholar says, 'Well, what this really means is "so and so," and the way these things fit together is here.' Because unless you can do some of that fitting together yourself, you're never really going to learn...."

Another woman speaks of the conditions in the Program that led to a sense of efficacy or empowerment which I referred to earlier, and a kind of intellectual awakening. In answer to the question about the greatest impact of the Program, she says:

> "I thought about that since I got the information from you in the mail. It was that I realized that I enjoyed intellectual pursuits. It was something that I got out of it personally. It wasn't just to go to school and get a good grade, but there was something more interesting beyond that. I went to graduate school...I think, partly as a result of the Program...as opposed to the other classes I took at Berkeley where I kind of floundered, not knowing what to major in and so on...but the notion that my thoughts were important, had some validity....And when you wrote something about the Iliad, you wrote what you thought, you didn't use secondary sources....I think that had a big impact on me. It's a simple notion but I think it really impacted how I sought intellectual pursuits after that...."

And one other example of how freedom in the Program led to independent thinking:

> "Oh, that's a hard question to answer, the major impact. I think for me, it was the realization that things at school weren't going to be nearly as prescribed as they had been in high school, and it was being forced to be independent and be an independent thinker. I look back...and that was a real shock to me. The requirements weren't as clear-cut as they had been in high school and we were given a tremendous amount of time to be studying independently. And that was at the time a tremendous adjustment for me, the lack of structure. But, looking back on it, I think that probably had the greatest impact, learning how to make choices about how I would spend my time....There wasn't any way of really checking on whether you were going to do the work or not, and realizing that I ultimately had to take charge of my own learning....I guess that's what I'm really saying."

These quotations illustrate some of the many themes arising from the study. The question we are finally left with is what can educators in colleges and universities of all kinds today learn from the Tussman study that may be useful in their varied institutions?

I believe that there are useful suggestions for the undergraduate curriculum throughout higher education. Not only large and rich research universities but other universities and colleges also can profit from what we learn from the Tussman Program. The major lesson is that cohesive programs informed by a thoughtful conception of undergraduate education, which occupy a substantial proportion of undergraduate lower division coursework, make a deep and lasting impression and have profound effects quite different from those of the aggregate of individual courses which ordinarily comprises the first two undergraduate years.

Certainly Tussman did not have the only curriculum adaptable to this model--other themes could inform other programs based on similar organizational arrangements. One could imagine an Experimental College Program focussing around the environment and ecological issues; or the history of technology; or the history of migration and ethnic and racial relations in the United States.

The most important common principles of such programs are coherence, shared reading, a common universe of discourse, and enough time and a suitable place for students and faculty to become not just a class or course but a learning community. Pedagogical approaches involving close and continued attention to a student's intellectual development through writings, seminars, tutorials, and informal discussions are other essential components. Can there be any doubt that the higher education community needs the kind of attention to teaching and learning that Tussman and his colleagues demonstrated in the sixties as much now as we did then?

References

Bauslaugh, Gary. "Proposal for a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies offered by The University of Victoria at Malaspina College." Malaspina College, British Columbia, 1990.

Gabelnick, F., MacGregor, J., Matthews, R.S., and Smith, B.L. *Learning Communities: Creating Connections Among Students, Faculty, and Disciplines*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 41. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Heirich, Max. *The Spiral of Conflict: Berkeley, 1964*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.

Hoelcle, Larene. *The University Experience: Eight Year Follow-Up...1966 and 1967 Freshmen*, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1977.

Light, Richard. *The Harvard Assessment Seminars: First Report*, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1990.

Meiklejohn, Alexander. *The Experimental College*. New York: Harper & Row, 1932.

Newcombe, Theodore. *Personality and Social Change*. New York: Holt, 1943.

Snyder, Benson R. *The Hidden Curriculum*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.

Suczek, Robert. *The Best Laid Plans*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1972.

Trow, Katherine. "The Experimental College Program in Retrospect: An Exploratory Study." Center for Studies in Higher Education. University of California, Berkeley, 1987.

Tussman, Joseph. "A Venture in Educational Reform: A Partial View." Center for Studies in Higher Education. University of California, Berkeley, 1988.

Tussman, Joseph. *Experiment at Berkeley*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

- 00

Appendix C

Katherine Trow

The Experimental College Program at Berkeley: Long Term Effects and Implications for Educational Practice

Chapter Outline

February 1992

THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE PROGRAM AT BERKELEY
Long-Term Effects and Implications for Educational Practice

Katherine Trow
February 1992

I

THE IMPACT OF THE PROGRAM

I Background
    A Description of the Experimental College Program and its history, the philosophy behind the Program, its beginnings, the first and second cycles and their differences, how and why it ended
    B Description of the study

The general impact of the Program on the lives of its former participants
    A What respondents say has been the biggest impact of the Program on their lives, its rewards and benefits
    B General impact summary
    C Were there any regrets about having been in the Program?
    D Would these respondents repeat the Program?
    E What changes would respondents make in the Program? What were their criticisms?
    F Summary

The educational and vocational effects of the Program
    A Educational awareness
    B "Elitism" and academic self esteem
    C Acquisition of academic skills
    D Transition from the Program to upper division in the regular university
    E The Program in relation to the choice of majors, the pros and cons of the "shopping around" experience
    F The effect on occupations, careers, and attitudes toward work
    G Summary

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IV The impact of the various components of the Program on its former participants
  1 Specific educational features
    a Lectures
    b Seminars
    c "Unattended seminars"
    d The curriculum the readings, first and second year differences
    e Papers
    f The journal
    g The intellectual biography
  2 The social and community aspects of the Program
    a Its size
    b "Culture shock" in response to the Program and to the larger University
    c Cohesiveness
    d Continuity
    e The House
    f Other living arrangement
    g Retreats
    h Identity with the Program

II

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

I Teaching in the Program
  A Competency and availability of faculty
  B Faculty turnover and its effect
  C The importance of agreement and disagreement among faculty
  D Teaching assistants
  E Pedagogical techniques and innovations
    1 team teaching
    2 The network of readings lectures, seminars papers, journals and tutorials
    3 Portfolios
    4 Structure vs non-structure

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. Accountability: no exams, no grades, no choices, no waiting lines
6. Diagnosis: Tussman's approach to the "quasi-therapeutic art of teaching"

II. The value of diversity in the Program: in its format, the readings, its faculty, its students

III. The community of scholars: of teachers and teachers, of teachers and students, of students and students, involvement (Harvard Educational Seminars), the importance of community over sociability among students and between faculty and students

IV. High school background as preparation for the Program in particular and for college in general

V. Recruitment to the Program
   A. The appeal of the Program to its applicants
   B. The appeal of Berkeley
   C. Other colleges Program applicants applied to, the Program at Berkeley as an alternative to private liberal arts colleges, to the regular U.C. lower division, other programs
   D. Parental involvement in the choice
   E. Risks in applying to Berkeley, to the Program

VI. Comparisons of the Program to the regular lower-division, to graduate school

VII. Developmental considerations
   A. Cognitive
   B. Psycho-social: the "Odyssey" experience
   C. Relationship to authority
   D. The placement of the Program in the life cycle

VIII. Historical considerations
   A. The campus political scene in the 60's
   B. Undergraduate education in the 60's: "sex and drugs and rock and roll" and "do your own thing"
   C. Interpretation of the "hidden agenda" of the Program: education for political vocation; "getting it"

IX. The education of particular groups
   A. Women, and men

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B. Ethnic minorities
C. Science, math, and engineering students
D. Slow learners, slow readers, enablement, empowerment, efficacy
E. Commuters

X. Drop-outs

XI. Summary of educational implications
A. For special programs such as this
B. For undergraduate education in general

III
APPENDICES

EOP students: a descriptive and comparative demography
A. Gender
B. Age distributions
C. Geographical backgrounds
D. Ethnicity
E. Religion
F. Type of high school
G. Occupations

College Attitude Study and the students in the Program: comparisons of answers to the questionnaire

III. Methodology
A. How respondents were chosen
B. How and where the interviews were conducted
C. The interview schedule
D. The abbreviated questionnaire for out-of-town respondents
E. Transcription and coding of the interviews

IV. Calendar of events on the Berkeley campus, 1964-1972

V. Map of the Berkeley campus

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix D

Joseph Tussman

A Venture in Educational Reform; A Partial View

Occasional Paper #67

Center for Studies in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

December 1988

Occasional Paper #67

A VENTURE IN EDUCATIONAL REFORM: A PARTIAL VIEW

Joseph Tussman

December 1988

Mr. Joseph Tussman is Professor Emeritus in Philosophy at the University of California, Berkeley, and a Faculty Associate of the Center.

**Center for Studies in Higher Education, South Hall Annex,
University of California, Berkeley, California 94720**

I pass the House every day. It stands at the edge of the campus, looking very much as it looked a quarter of a century ago. It had once been a Fraternity house, but when I first got involved with it, in the early sixties, it had been standing vacant, almost derelict, not yet assigned to its University use. It became the home of the Experimental Program and the center of my life for four years--a slowly fading scar for a lot longer. It now, more sedately, houses a Graduate program. The last time I stepped inside, almost a decade ago, I noted the familiar mellow wooden panels in the Great Hall, now without a defacing collection of student poems protesting my behavior, and I saw, still in use, the enormous round wooden table that had taken up most of the room in my office--the table I had found in the University warehouse, around which the fabled Teggart had once conducted his Seminar.

There was a time when the sight of the House in the early morning produced a surge of anxiety, a deep reluctance to approach the door, to open it and step into whatever it held for the day. And for some years after I had ceased to enter, the mere sight of the building as I drove past evoked a vague sense of apprehension that dissipated slowly as I moved through the paces of a normal academic day--as a disturbing dream lingers and fades through an uneventful morning. But now when I pass the house nothing happens. It may be possible at last, "all passion spent," to recollect in tranquility.

The question most difficult for me to deal with is "why did the Program fail?" I usually rush to explain that as an educational venture it did not fail; that it "failed" only in not establishing itself as a permanent part of the University. But there is something unsatisfactory about that answer. Why, if it was educationally valid or even significant, did it disappear without a trace?

I have never really told the story of the Program. In the middle of its third year I wrote Experiment at Berkeley, giving an account of the rationale and of some of the problems we were facing. It was essentially a progress report. I have never completed the report nor written anything about the problems of "educational reform" or about the state of college education generally, or joined very seriously in our local education controversies. When the Experimental Program had run its trial four-year life I returned to writing and to departmental teaching for the dozen years until retirement. I did not turn away from the Program as a sad experience best buried in oblivion, but, obviously, I put off writing about it. Experiment at Berkeley does give a good idea of what it was all about, so some of the things I would want to say have already been said--although without the benefit or disadvantage of several decades of reflection. There are things to add and things that deserve emphasis and amplification, but apparently not urgently enough to have overcome my reluctance to plunge back into the depressing world of educational controversy to reargue tattered issues.

Since this is reflection on "educational reform" let me say that I am not concerned with "normal" educational improvement. Reasonably good teachers improve with experience, although they may grow out of the stage of energetic novice enthusiasm whose glow may be mistaken for the aura of Socratic genius. The teaching of good teachers tends to grow better; the teaching of poor teachers tends not to improve, or not to improve enough to make up for the belatedly discovered mistake in hiring. Improving the educational system by improving teaching is obviously a good thing. But American Higher Education is not in danger of being destroyed by bad teaching, nor, if it needs salvation, is it going to be saved by an outburst of great teaching or by the improvement of its normal teaching. The state of the art of teaching is not, for the college or university, a life-threatening problem.

And, of course, in a good or, as we are in the habit of saying at Berkeley, a "great" university, the level of conventional teaching is bound to be rather high. There are always complaints, some even legitimate: classes too large or too hard to get into, confusing advice, preoccupied or unsympathetic faculty. But the place is undeniably full of vigorous minds engaged in research and in teaching, full of bright students doing what bright students are supposed to do. Most consider themselves lucky to be where they are, not awaiting reform.

Why then, at such a place, in the early sixties, did I think that a drastically different educational model should be tried? And not tried merely as one does an experiment to prove a point or a theory, but as an effort to bring about a significant change in our educational way of life. To work out the conception of an alternative pattern, to show that it worked, in practice, much better than the conventional pattern--*much* better, since if it was only as good as or a slight improvement over what we had, it would not be worth the trouble--and then to keep it alive as a regular and even growing part of the University and a model for adoption by colleges and universities everywhere. That was the idea, the dream, the project.

The Program was not a response to particular events or pressures. Students had not yet discovered the delights of hurling themselves upon the cushioned cogs of the Machine demanding institutional change, and, in any case, student educational demands, as they came to be made, were utterly at odds with the spirit of the Program. There was deep irony in the fact that the student movement on the educational front fought under the banners of the system it thought it hated. That is, it demanded "decontrol," the abolition of "requirements," consumer sovereignty, an elective system ad absurdum--the Marketplace, in short. Whereas, alas, I considered the "marketplace" applied to education or to the mind as bizarrely oxymoronic. But I am getting ahead of myself....

The Program, I repeat, was not a response to pressure. No one was demanding it or anything like it. So far as I am aware, I did not need it. I had recently returned to Berkeley after a half dozen or so years in the East. I was delighted to be back. I was a Professor in the Philosophy Department. I had tenure. I had written a book. My classes were going well. I had a backlog of writing projects. I was not even on a Committee to Foster Educational Innovation. Why, then, an unsolicited venture in educational reform?

I suppose that a purely analytic treatment of the educational issues posed and faced by the Experimental Program could avoid that question. The account of genesis is more historical and biographical than analytical; the order of creation and development is not the same as the order of justification. But this is a sort of Apologia and an Apologia, if we can judge by its great models, is a complex mixture of the two orders. At any rate, I will say something about the genesis of the Program, not so much out of autobiographical concerns as for its relevance to the problem of introducing significant change into the educational system. Significant or at least drastic change--if that is, in the end, what one wants.

There is a kind of ameliorative change that is rather easy to achieve. A professor can usually fiddle with his course as he pleases. He can change its substance and its methods as he thinks best without anyone's permission. With little trouble he can substitute new courses for old ones and keep his teaching in line with his interests and educational convictions. This sort of change is generally so easy that there is seldom an accumulation of frustration calling for drastic measures. From the faculty point of view, being able to teach what one wishes, as one thinks best, without external interference, is, short of teaching less and in the extreme case not at all, to enjoy the good life. To change, modify, improve the courses one teaches does not require one to be an educational reformer.

There is also a familiar class of educational changes beyond these that, generally, do not interfere very much with the established way of life. Should a requirement be added or dropped for all or for a special group of students? More math or writing or a foreign language or American or Western or World history? Should all students be required to achieve computer literacy or ethnic consciousness? Should a new or an interdisciplinary "major" be established or the requirements for a particular major changed? Should grading be tougher, more revealing than tactful, or forced on a curve, and should students grade their teachers? Should we divide the year into quarters or semesters? Should we have small courses or seminars for freshmen? Questions of this sort have popped up on the academic agenda for as long as I can remember, staple items in the politics of education, normally requiring collective faculty and Administrative action. Faculty members differ in their degree of concern with such matters taken as general education questions. They will, however, be alert to proposals that affect their own teaching, resistant to those that might require them to handle their own courses differently, and supportive of the claims of colleagues to teaching autonomy.

It is obvious, of course, that all this is about "courses"--about their inner life and their external ordering. The COURSE is the familiar, the inevitable unit of our educational life. To teach is to give a course; to study is to take a course or a mildly ordered collection of courses; to administer is to arrange that the takers and the givers are properly brought together. The fate of the Experimental Program can be foreshadowed in a simple statement: In a world of course-givers and course-takers it tried to abolish "the course."

I need here to account for two things: the shaping of the alternate conception of lower-division liberal education, and the motivation to try to bring it into existence.

I forget who it was who first said, "Nothing is ever said for the first time"--broadened for this occasion into "or thought...." Discovering what you believe is discovering the tradition into which you fall. My deepest educational conviction is certainly not original. It is that what we call "liberal education" is essentially the education of the Ruler. It is not primarily aesthetic--for the heightening of "enjoyment," the enriching of leisure. It is not the education of the Human Being as Human Being. It is not the education for scholarship or research or the professoriate. It is not primarily spectatorial. It is vocational, and the vocation is governing or ruling--in a broad sense, Politics. It is the Forbidden Fruit so deeply associated with our aspirations for participation in the ruling function. To say this is, of course, to raise all sorts of spectres and to summon hostile spirits from the vasty deep--worthy opponents, decent, well-motivated, cultured, humane, skeptical, tolerant, anti-authoritarian opponents--all honorable, although tending to archophobia and to regarding this "merely" political emphasis as a disparagement of the mind that is to be valued for its own sake. Nevertheless, it was, for me, the conception at the very heart of the Experimental Program, without which I would not have tried to launch it and without which, therefore, it would not have come into existence at all. It was, although I am resigned to the probability that this will seem at least paradoxical, the educational vision of a rabid democrat.

I consider myself indebted for this view to my teacher, Alexander Meiklejohn, and I have been dominated by it for as long as I can remember, and long before the Program took shape. I need to acknowledge, although I do so reluctantly, a fundamental disposition expressing itself in a drift into political and legal philosophy, manifesting an intellectual provincialism giving its special character to the curricular core of the Program. "Reluctantly," because I would like to think of the Program as based on something more than a temperamental devotion to the "political" as against other claims. At any rate, I start with the conception of the wonderfully baffling idea of Liberal Education as education for the ruling function and the companion conviction that since everyone in a Democracy is to share in the ruling function, everyone needed to share in the education reserved, in elitist societies, to the ruling class.

To this must be added the perception that the college was not providing it and, rather fortuitously, that there was a vacuum where it should or might be. The freshman and sophomore years, the Lower Division, is generally the wasteland of American higher education. That is, in part, because we still tend to protect those years against vocationalism or professionalism dominating the graduate schools and even the upper-division "majors," without having a very clear idea of what we are protecting them for. The lower division student is not yet under the aegis of a particular department, has not made his fateful choice and is considered to be engaged in remedial or preparatory or exploratory or even "general" education. From the point of view of the dominant power structures--graduate and research-oriented departments--the lower division is someone else's responsibilty, a holding area in which some grazing is done before, fleshed out a bit, the creature can be put to serious work. If anyone is responsible for the lower-division student it is probably a powerless Dean trying to marshall some educational energy not elsewhere engaged (and therefore a bit suspect), for a venture professional scholars seldom find professionally interesting or important--except, perhaps, as an exercise in recruiting. But this is an old and hackneyed tale and I will not linger over it. The Program idea was to take the conception of liberal education as broadly politically vocational and insert it into the spiritually empty lower division years--thus filling a deep but unfelt need while at the same time giving a significant point to an otherwise pointless phase of American college education.

The curricular embodiment of this conception needs to be spelled out, but it might appear to be something that could be done in the usual way by stringing courses together and, if necessary, creating some special courses--by creating, in effect, a lower-division variant of an upper-division disciplinary or interdisciplinary "major." Why, then, did the Program abandon the course structure and propose instead a single massive highly organized two-year "program"? Since this was the distinctive feature of the Program most responsible for its unique quality and for its special problems, I suppose I should explain. But I may do so slowly and in bits and pieces.

Imagine, if you can, that you are a freshman newly enrolled in the Program. You will be introduced to the idea that, unlike what you have been used to, you will, during the life of the Program, be doing--be thinking about--only one thing at a time. And you are told that for the next two weeks or so you are to spend all of your time, all of your time (well, almost all, since you will be allowed to take one course, a language course, for example, in addition to the Program--"comic relief," I heard it called) reading or "studying" Homer's Iliad. You are advised not to bother reading about Homer or Iliad, not to consult secondary or scholarly or "critical" material--just to read Iliad itself. You will not be aware of the blood that had been shed in support of those instructions, of the academic proprieties being trampled on, but you might consider it a strange beginning to a college career. You had expected more formidable assignments but, accepting unexpected gifts, you decide to go along--not without the shadow of a worry that you may not be going to get a real college education after all. ("All the guys in my Dorm are already taking quizzes in three subjects and I'm still just fooling around with the Iliad!")

What we are trying to do, and probably without much initial success, is to lead the student into the experience of relaxed, enjoyable immersion, a sustained involvement of mind, in a great work whose significance is far from obvious and about whose significance nothing, at this stage of the game, should be said. Many people will go through college--through a lifetime--without such an experience. Two whole weeks out of your life in which your job is to soak yourself in Iliad or something like it. But this is not to be an exercise in solitary reading. Everyone in the Program will be doing the same thing, including the faculty. And during those two weeks there will be some scheduled Program activity. Informal lectures or panel discussions, seminar meetings, a short paper to be discussed in a private tutorial session. And all, during that two-week period, on Iliad. Intensive, undistracted, essentially enjoyment-directed. Clearly, all our resources are marshalled to encourage the having of a particular kind of intellectual and emotional experience. It is very difficult to describe, but we have gone to a great deal of trouble to try to make it possible. We have cleared the decks, provided the time, gotten rid of a distracting multiplicity of intellectual tasks, tried to discourage the desire for information of a scholarly, historical, literary, sociological sort, to restrain the tendency to find out what others have said, from doing "research." But what, you may well ask, is there left to do? And why do that? This is, I am afraid, one of those familiar situations in which it is futile to try to explain to someone why he should do something until after he has done it. Of course, freeing up time, telling students to relax and wallow in a book and try to enjoy it, doesn't do very much. If you have been taught to read rapidly you will have forgotten how to read slowly; you will simply read rapidly and wonder what to with all the spare time on your hands. And no one will enjoy something because a teacher tells him to. And what, by the way, if it is difficult to explain what the student was supposed to do, was the faculty supposed to do?

I am almost afraid to confess that the faculty was not supposed to do what it was supposed to be good at, what it had been chosen by the University to spend its life doing. We were not to practice the "disciplines" with which we, as faculty members, were identified. There were five of us. I was a member of the Philosophy Department, usually teaching courses in political or legal philosophy. I had recruited as colleagues in this venture: a political theorist with a great reputation as a charismatic teacher; a talented poet, a bit Byronic, who later created some havoc as the academic vice president of a private university and died gloriously hang-gliding; a radical youngish civil liberties lawyer, a bulldog in argument, reputedly a strong "Socratic" teacher; a mathematician-engineer, a well-known maverick, politician, golfer, and a man of broad culture. None of us had grappled professionally with Iliad. What or how were we to "teach"?

But I should explain first (I see I may have problems with Shandyesque tendencies) how this odd crew came to be gathered around the large table contemplating such a strange problem. I need to make a rather delicate decision. Or rather, explain it, since I have obviously made it. I am going to talk about faculty colleagues. I need to, or I can't explain why the odds are so stacked against the success of such a program. There is really very little written about the college teacher at work. I used to read every academic novel I could get my hands on, and it is surprising how little is revealed about teaching. Compared to the surgeon working in the glare of the operating room the professor's teaching is normally a private affair, largely shielded from peer scrutiny. Of the several dozen colleagues from a variety of departments with whom I have gossiped at lunch for several decades, labored on committees and manned the academic barricades with, I cannot think of one whose class I have ever visited or who has visited one of mine. We assume, I suppose, that we can infer from a person's ordinary behavior how he would behave as a teacher. Apart from ordinary risks in inference I have discovered belatedly that, adding to predictive risks, there are actually teachers who think of teaching as a performing art, and who, when they enter a classroom, become strangely transformed. Ordinarily, it may not matter. As long as each is enclosed in his own watertight compartment the great ship of learning can stay afloat even if some compartments collapse or shelter weird sideshows. But if you put to sea in a single ark....

Between the conception and the fruition lay a great many obstacles. The first step I took, before I discussed my plan with anyone else, was to drop in on President Clark Kerr. As University President, he was not directly in charge of the Berkeley campus, but I thought his support would be useful. I told him I wanted to try to establish a variant of Meiklejohn's Experimental College and wanted to know whether, if I got through the campus obstacles, there would be difficulties at a higher level. I remember his pleased smile. "Ah," he said, "the Revolution from below!" Of course he was all for it. He believed in education and, as President, there was little he could do; education was in the hands of the faculty. I told him I'd be back if I got far enough to need his help, and we parted cheerfully.

There were a number of decisive points at which, if I did nothing, if I sat still, peace, like a frightened kitten, would return, but if I did something, took the contemplated step, wrote the letter, asked to appear before the committee, I would have to face the next problem, more deeply and inextricably involved. And eventually, retreat would no longer be an option.

The visit to Kerr was a first tentative step; I had indulged an impulse but had not yet assumed a commitment. I cannot explain the movement from having an idea about how things might be, to actually trying to do something about it without evoking the compelling powers of discipleship, of hero-worship, of sheer stubbornness and pride. I was driven by the desire to vindicate the educational vision of Alexander Meiklejohn. Of course, I got no encouragement or support in this venture from Meiklejohn himself, although he was still living in Berkeley when I made the opening moves. I now think that I was obtuse not to realize that he must have had deep reservations about my project and that, had I asked him, he might have advised against it. (What, I wonder, would I say now if an old student told me...?) But it never occurred to me to ask, and he died before the Program came into being. I mention all this to acknowledge that, as is so often the case, behind the public proposal lurks a private passion.

I would need to do three things to bring the program into existence. First, I would need to draw up an educational proposal that could win the approval of the appropriate faculty authorities. There had to be something on paper a committee or a Faculty could consider and judge academically legitimate or respectable or desirable. This would pose some problems since I was asking approval not for the usual single course in a traditional departmental subject, but for a non-departmental offering worth the equivalent in academic credit of about 16 out of the 20 semester courses normally taken in the first two years. Beyond the enormity of that, I was unable and unwilling to do more than offer a brief sketch of the plan. I did not propose to spend time working up a detailed syllabus to offer to a committee for its approval, not only because I found the task uncongenial, or because I shuddered at the thought of opening myself to the scrutiny of what I felt, correctly, to be the hostile academic mind of which, in educational matters, I had a rather deep distrust, but because, for reasons I now turn to, it was impossible. What was needed was a formulation clear enough to give a fair idea of the plan and vague enough to allow for a wide range of discretion as we went along.

I needed--this was the second of my three tasks--to find or recruit colleagues. In the intuitive groping for form I had settled upon about 125 to 150 students as a good number. And since I did not want an experiment that, if successful, could be dismissed as "too expensive," I thought we needed a faculty of five or six--something like a ridiculous 25:1 ratio. So I began to look for four or five colleagues. Who?

It was clear, to begin with, that it would be foolish to consider anyone without tenure. We needed regular tenured Berkeley faculty members whose respectability would do something to fill the gap left by the sketchiness of the proposal. On the other hand, we needed teachers who were bold or reckless enough to step out into a wilderness unmarked by reassuring disciplinary signs. Respectable adventurous teachers are not people to whom you can hand a syllabus someone else has worked out. Normally they are the masters of their own courses. If they enter into cooperative ventures at all, they do so as "colleagues."

My problem, then, was to find colleagues, and that turned out to be extremely diffficult. I could not simply approach someone as if with a tabula rasa. Should we make up an educational program? I wanted people who liked the general idea and were willing to work out the details together as we went along. But acceptance of the general idea, as I described it, was a primary necessity; there were some curricular and pedagogic givens--or I would not have bothered with the whole business. And this created a situation about which I was quite uneasy. I was clearly the prime mover and conception guardian, but I was trying to find full colleagues--I was quite romantic about collegiality--who would be happy to implement the plan. It was to be our program even though it was really my idea. As you can see, I was a bit naive.

Most of the people I approached were not interested or available. They were fully occupied with their work, had all sorts of plans and commitments, wouldn't think of taking two years off to go slumming outside their own fields, were vaguely puzzled that I would, but no, thanks. I hasten to say that I do not criticize them. They were fully occupied with research and teaching and University service, they were doing good, distinguished work and there was no reason for them to stop in order to do something they didn't believe in doing or didn't think they could do well. Nor do I really object to the fact that the Berkeley faculty is what it is--a group of hardworking, self-directed, high-powered, research and graduate school oriented professors--clearly reflecting its primary function. But there is a lower division, and I thought we could afford, there, a daring attempt at a different form of significance--staffed by its regular faculty, not by a group of lower-division teachers not up to regular or peculiarly Berkeley standards.

I had great difficulty recruiting, and might well have had to give up. But in the end I found two who could come in, but only for a single year, and two who could come in for two years--enough for the launching. We decided to settle for a group of graduate student teaching assistants instead of trying to find a sixth faculty member. The process was even more complicated than it sounds. It was a sort of juggling act. I couldn't really push for program approval until I could point to a faculty. I couldn't tie down a faculty member, get him to change his plans and arrange leave from his regular duties in his department, unless the program was given an academic green light, and that was far from a sure thing--in fact it was downright unlikely. And finally, nothing could be done without a budget--salaries, space, staff support, and all that. And it was hard to arrange that without having done the other things first--which could not be done first without budgetary assurances. And I was in a hurry; I did not intend to get bogged down in "planning"; it was "next year or not at all."

In the end, budgetary and other matters depending on the Administration turned out to present no problems at all. The Administration was invariably and ungrudgingly helpful, granting every request (of course I made only reasonable requests) and easing every diffculty. Academic approval was, I think, the greatest hurdle. I won't trace the complicated process, but one scene persists in fond memory.

It was a meeting of the College of Letters and Science at which I was to present the plan for approval. I had distributed a couple of pages explaining the Program curriculum. Sketchy, of course, and not very deeply analyzed. I elaborated a bit and took questions. Then up rose a stalwart old-timer, an old-world social democrat whom I greatly admired for his stentorian defense of freedom and virtue in past academic battles. "I see," he boomed, "that you start with the Greeks. Very Good. Then you jump to Seventeenth Century England. Also very good. Then you go to early America and then to present day America. Good! Good! So it is a Historical Program, is it not?"

It wasn't, but I hadn't figured out quite how to describe it. I began something like "not exactly" or "well, sort of, but...." But he would not be denied. "A Historical Program! But look at the Gaps. Full of Gaps. For a Historical Program too many Gaps!" He smiled at me, pitying, benign. "Too many Gaps. I will vote against it!"

Someone came to my aid. "Isn't it really just a study of periods of crisis, of revolution--that's it, a study of Revolution?"

"I suppose so," I mumbled gratefully--a mumble I would pay for later.

Then rose a very bright young Professor, greatly admired for having introduced the phrase "academic oatmeal" into our deliberations, to ask whether I was open to suggestions. "If I started considering all your good suggestions," I said tactfully, "I'd end up where we are now. So I guess it's take it or leave it."

Naturally, after that brilliant defense, it was approved. I'll skip further harrowing details; in a relatively short time we were all ready to go. But before I get back to Iliad I want to take up several things that combined, as it turned out, to make my life miserable, taking all the joy out of the first two years.

There was the House. It was obvious that some sort of physical center was needed. If students were to interact in a common program there had to be someplace for them to meet. Space was scarce and we considered, as a last resort, taking over a student dorm. Apart from whether that would have been possible, we were not sure it was a good idea to add the problems of residential separateness to those of distinctive curricular eccentricity. In the end we considered ourselves lucky to be able to capture an abandoned fraternity house on the edge of the campus, and it was patched up and sparsely furnished for our use. Rooms were fixed up as offices for the faculty, a few as seminar rooms. There was a Program office, a large reading room, a great hall. Not lavish, but adequate. I suppose it was because I began with such high hopes that I came to detest the very sight of it. I had dreamed that it would be the lively center of our life, a place you could drop in to at any time and find students and faculty working and talking.... Well, I am not, a quarter of a century later, going to allow myself to feel again the disgust at the ugly culture that came to dominate and to mock the University conception of civilization. What should have been part of an adult University became a juvenile counter-culture hangout. I felt responsible for the existence of the House and felt guilty at my betrayal of my University colleagues who had trusted me to conduct, in their name, an experiment in Liberal Education. For the first two years, the sight of the House made me sick.

Contributing to the discord was a decision we had taken, about which the faculty had had its first disagreement. When it appeared that we could not find a sixth faculty member we decided, as I said, to take on five graduate student teaching assistants. There was a great deal of writing and we thought we would need help in reading and discussing student papers. There was never any thought--we explicitly rejected the thought--that the TAs would assume full or general faculty roles. We were seeking assistants, not colleagues. We invited applications. There was a complication. Usually a TA is a graduate student working for a Ph.D. degree in a department, assisting in an area, a discipline, in which he is working, getting experience in his own field. That was not possible in our "non-disciplinary" program and we worried about diverting a graduate student from his primary work in his home department, but we concluded that if the TA was kept narrowly to reading papers and discussing them with the students, the experience would be a good one and not too distracting. In the process of selection it became clear that a graduate student very active in the student movement had virtually managed to wring an utterly unauthorized promise from our poet. Trying to forestall this, I had, in turn, gotten the assurance that no commitment would be made. I did not want him because I had seen enough of him to conclude that he was a pretentious militant who would not accept an "assistant" role and would dedicate himself to bringing the Revolution to the Program. I thought he would be uncontrollable and destructive and that we would have enough problems without this one. So I explained why I was against taking him on. His faculty "sponsor" admitted the danger, but said he had indeed promised and that he would undertake to "control" him. I knew he would be unable to do that and I was adamant. What to do?

Since this was a rather fateful turning point, I must explain that we had no formal structure of authority. We had no Chairman, no Director, no Head, no CEO. I happened to still be Chairman of the Philosophy Department, but that had absolutely nothing to do with the Program. I had never had a Program title but had drifted, not unnaturally, into being the one who had to sign things. Whatever I may have thought, I religiously refused to let the words "my Program" cross my lips or even emerge from between clenched teeth. I was, as I have said, Romantic about collegial equality. But a decision needed to be made and, oddly enough, we had no way of doing so. I felt strongly enough about this matter to brood, over a weekend, about simply asserting a veto power, but I didn't think the Program would survive such an act and, against my better and bitter judgment agreed to abide by a majority vote. I lost, of course, 2-3. I never forgave the triumphant three--two of whom knew they were only to stay in the Program for one year but still had no qualms about violating the obviously appropriate principle of consensus. Needless to say, my worst fears were quickly realized, and in a few short months the entire faculty agreed that we would have to work without TAs, although the damage had been done and the first Program was in something of a sullen, alienated shambles.

But while the problem of Authority manifested itself first over an "administrative" question it underlay the Program more fundamentally and, because of its intrinsic nature, in ways not generally present in the College at large. The Program attempted to establish an intellectual community, a "college," and it conceived of such a community not as a collection of persons living in the same place, or rooting for the same team, or, as Clark Kerr once said, united by a common grievance over Parking, but as a group of persons studying the same thing. We had a required curriculum that lasted for two years and we were all to go through it together--reading, writing, thinking about the same works at the same time. So to begin with, there had to be some curricular-determining authority. Obviously, the "faculty." The Program did not share in the increasingly popular view that a student's human right to participate in the decisions that affected his life extended to his voting on the reading list or deciding whether, indeed, he would write an assigned paper. But usually, where the Course is the unit of educational life, the individual professor is in authority, determines course content and method, and works out a modus vivendi with his students. In the Program, no single professor was in authority, could not do as he pleased about those things normally subject to his pleasure, was not free to exercise his discretion, let us say, in modifying or changing assignments. Faculty and students alike subjected the Program to centrifugal forces that could all too easily have destroyed its unity, its character, its very excuse for existing. If, for example, we had decided to raise the problem of obedience to law by reading *Antigone*, it was not up to one of us to decide to read *Billy Budd* instead, or even in addition. We might entertain an argument that *Billy Budd* was better than *Antigone* and that we should all read it instead, but we wanted all students to be studying the same thing. If faculty members are free to choose their own variations they will do so in preference to arguing about the best common decision, avoiding the most fruitful kind of educational discussion--apart from destroying what is common in a supposedly common enterprise.

Or, if a student, living at his own unique rhythm, wanted extra time to complete a paper due, for good arbitrary reasons, on Friday, he needed to be told to get it in on time, that we did not want a better paper later, that we wanted the best he could do by Friday, that there was no such thing as a "late" paper, that he was, after Friday, to be starting on the next assignment, not to be alone and palely loitering with the old....

Or again, a student will announce, after the *Iliad* (which the student may have been reluctant to read in the first place) that he now wants to devote his life to the study of The Epic, and would like to be excused from Thucydides and all that in order to work on *Beowulf* and *Burnt Njal* and *Gilgamesh* and *Aenead* and *Morte d'Arthur*, etc.--and is stunned when he is told that if he wants to stay in the Program he will do the Program work and that if he wants to write his own ticket he can leave.

I need hardly point out that all these--and other--tendencies to fly apart, to take our separate amiable ways to salvation, come clothed in attractive educational or metaphysical garb. The enemy is not the power of brute anti-intellectual inertia; it is the romantic, individualistic, consumer-oriented view of reality with which we have perforce become well acquainted. Under some circumstances it carries the day--"nothing," I used to say, "is as irresistible as an error whose time has come"--and it was sweeping the American Campus even as we tried to establish a small island of sanity. But to protect the Program required a systematic and constant assertion of Authority. Its common character had to be protected against the tendency to fly apart. Someone had to say, "NO."

Oddly enough, after my defeat in our one and only vote, it was as if by general consent, without comment, I was left in charge. I made a few unsuccessful attempts to develop a genuinely cooperative way of life. An attempt to establish a faculty dinner meeting once a week was abandoned after a single farcical meeting. The assembly meetings, because, I think, of faculty reluctance to perform without shining, fell apart. A small student faction took over the House and drove most students away. Some faculty members became "cult" or coterie figures, subtly shielding students from my tyranny. And I sank more deeply into the dictatorial or authoritarian role. Anguish at a distance is, I find, essentially Comic, and I am now faintly amused at what once tormented and enraged me. I remember lying awake nights reviewing the twisting path from Clark Kerr's office to yesterday's ordeal at the House, resolving that I would not, after everything I had gone through, abandon the Program to the irresponsible views or impulses of those who would turn the Program into a caricature of the elective system that had reduced American college education to the mediocre joke against which the Program was to stand as a fruitful alternative. If the Program had been my idea, the Mess was my fault; I would fight it through, and, after the first two-year run--I could see no way of salvaging it--try again with a different faculty. And in the meantime I, who was still a card carrying member of the American Civil Liberties Union, a veteran of the Loyalty Oath fight, a Meiklejohnian extremist in defense of the First Amendment and, for that matter, a deep rebel against the practices of the educational establishment, slipped without a murmur into the role of wielder and defender of Authority.

It was, of course, necessary. For example, when even those who had voted for my TA bane had had enough of being undermined and agreed unanimously (the last straw for the sponsoring Poet was overhearing the advice given to a student who had emerged from a tutorial session. The Poet had requested the rewriting of a short paper along certain lines. "Don't do it," we heard the TA urging, "don't do what he says. Just do what you want....") that the TAs should all be allowed to finish the year but not be reappointed. I said that they should be informed in time to apply for appointments in their own departments. All agreed. As the deadline approached, worried that if they were not notified they would have a legitimate complaint, a claim to reappointment, I kept reminding the faculty. But weeks passed and they were not notified by their strangely reluctant supervisors. Finally, I told the

128

Secretary to hand each TA a letter, by me, informing them that they would not be reemployed. Naturally, at the next Assembly I was handed a petition by students requesting that the TAs be reappointed, and naturally I said "no." (I admit it may have been tactless of me, standing at the Podium, to do what I usually do when presented with a bit of student writing--reach for a pencil and start correcting....) I did not bother to embarrass anyone by stressing that it was a unanimous faculty decision, and no one came to my support. There was an uproar, but I did not budge. Nor explain. What was there to explain? That this was a counter-revolutionary putsch? Or that in a Program that did not allow students to determine the curriculum students had no role in choosing their teachers? I had to go East for a conference on Education--ironically, to explain the Program--and when I returned I found that all the furniture in the Great Hall had been piled into a pyramid that reached the ceiling. The deserted house echoed to my steps. I did nothing and the pyramid gradually eroded. We staggered through the year. For the second year I was able to get some faculty replacements and we managed a sort of weary truce. Quite a few students dropped out and into the regular University across the street, many unwilling to put up with the turmoil. Most of the most active of the rebellious students stayed on, naturally, manifesting their own deep loyalty to the Program. I should say, lest this general complaint misleads you, that on the whole the students were intelligent, energetic, imaginative, and with a strong sense of integrity. Also, in spite of evrything, full of charm and promise. I really remember them with pleasure. I owed it to them to have chosen a faculty less beset by vanity and insecurity. And I owe it to the TAs, also, to acknowledge that, on the whole, they were well-motivated and helpful. After the first year we worked without them, and the decision to do so was a wise one. But not because of ideological or personality clashes or because they were poorly chosen but because of something deeper. Bright graduate students are at the stage of their careers at which they are most technically involved in their disciplines. If they teach, that is what they should be teaching. They should not be thrown into a non-disciplinary arena where they cannot use what they are in the process of mastering. It is no reflection on their intelligence or teaching talent to say that they are not, at that stage of their careers, ideally suited for ventures in liberal education, however attracted to it they may be.

This has been a longer excursion than I had expected into the institutional background of the Program. It is time to return to a consideration of what would justify all the trouble. What were we to do with, to make of, Iliad? We had all read it during the previous summer (or rather, "reread" it, since I learned that you do not ask a Professor if he has read one of the obvious classics, you ask if he has reread it recently). Obviously, we did not expect our Engineer to focus on the fortifications of Troy and the defenses of the beached fleet, the Poet to focus on Homeric art or do an Auden on the Shield of Achilles, the Political Scientist to lecture on government on the Plains of Troy, the Lawyer to enlighten us about Agamemnon v. Achilles in re Briseis, the Philosopher to pontificate about Zeus, Fate, and Freedom. But what? We were rather nervous. I remember the Lawyer complaining privately to me with a hopeless shrug, "What's there to teach? There are no arguments to analyze!" He cheered up when I suggested that the Thersites episode could be seen as a free-speech class-struggle case. Well, it's really a wonderful book and you might want to reread it if you haven't done so lately. But Teach it?

Years later I was a guest at a gathering of St. John's faculty--a highly accomplished group of teachers--and strolling to lunch I listened to a senior member fondly extolling his own old teacher. "My life changed forever when he walked into a class on Homer and asked his first question!" I broke in eagerly, afraid he might not explain, to ask what the question was. "Oh," he said, surprised, as if the answer was obvious, "What was Achilles like?" I remember my surge of pleasure at his reply. Of course! Nothing about the profound significance of the Homeric World View and all that. What was Achilles like, and Hector, and Helen, and Agamemnon...and off we go.

By instinct or by some happy accident we decided that at the first assembly--"lecture"--each of the five faculty members would simply read out the passage in Iliad that appealed to him most, with perhaps a brief remark. It should make an interesting, revealing, provocative opening exercise, encouraging students in a similiar venture, sharpening the intensity of their reading. I still, after twenty years, remember it vividly. The Engineer who was also an elected city official, a practicing politician, focused on the futile attempt of some Greek leaders to lure Achilles who was, as we know, sulking in his tent, back into the struggle, and marvelled that here was a man with a grievance who, unlike most political leaders he knew, simply couldn't be bought, wouldn't compromise, had no price.... The Poet movingly deployed the scene in which the aged King Priam was reduced to pleading with his son's killer for the return of his son's body. The Lawyer, of course, read the Thersites bit with great passion, his voice ringing with indignation over the fact that Odysseus would simply strike the only man who dared to question the value of the war at a public meeting while fellow soldiers laughed and applauded Odysseus, ridiculing their own spokesman, as blood trickled down Thersites' back and a tear ran down his cheek. I read the long passage in which Hector, awaiting the furious approach of Achilles and almost certain death, toyed with the possibility of avoiding battle, yearning for the bygone days of peace, resigning himself to his doom in a soliloquy unmatched, I think, except for Satan's on Niphates in Paradise Lost.

Well, the Iliad is full of great things and we did our best reading our Rorschach bits. Except for the Political Scientist. He stood up, opened his book to the first page, read the opening sentence, turned to the back of the book, read the last sentence, opened it somewhere near the middle and read a random sentence. Then he said, "It's an organism. Wherever you cut it, it bleeds." And resumed his seat. Point, set, match. A sharp collective intake of breath from the assembled students. Hail the victor! While I thought: "The S.O.B. He's staked out his position. The Program Rebel. Not for him to do what we had agreed to do. Even in a Program itself in rebellion he is more rebellious still. Pompous drivel, but appealing. Impressive. He is going to play the Pied Piper and steal the children...."

I am quite aware that by even mentioning this episode I invite you to think me over-sensitive, jealous, unbalanced, disturbed by what I should have merely smiled at. I did, in fact, merely smile. I did not say what I thought. But what I thought was utterly correct, prophetic. I saw a subtle breaking of faculty discipline, an "individualistic" act, an invitation to the battle of vanities. The Political Scientist had clearly gotten off to a good start and was never headed. The radical lawyer, thenceforth, played the even more Radical Lawyer, the romantic poet the even more Romantic Poet. Only the mathematician was unaffected, full of down-to-earth common sense and aware that there was no place for him in the dance of the prima donnas. As for me, my role was unmistakable. I was the symbol of Authority, of the Establishment, the doomed Defender of the flawed System (Aha! Hector!). I must have found the role congenial, since I sank into it easily and seem to have been playing it ever since.

I will let this odd episode stand for the many ways, subtle and not so subtle, in which the conflict between the tendency to fly apart into autonomous journeys and the insistence on a common path found expression. Obviously, the easier course is to abandon resistance to entropy or the death-wish and allow everyone--faculty, and perhaps even students--to go their own ways, pursuing their own interests. But the whole point of the Program was its commitment to a special kind of common intellectual life that by its very commonality nourished a deeper individuality. There was no reason for our existence if we were going to recreate the free market that generally prevailed in the University--autonomy for professors, elective options for students. It took a constant and active assertion of authority to counter the tendency to degenerate into chaos.

In a jointly taught program, the unity of the faculty on certain questions is crucial. On certain questions. I want to make it clear that vigorous faculty disagreement, open, prolonged, heated, is essential to the vigor and success of the enterprise. I used to say that we must agree on "constitutional" questions in order to disagree on "legislative" ones. Perhaps I should say that we must agree on procedural matters in order to be able to disagree fruitfully about substantive questions. To agree to read a book is the necessary prelude to significant disagreement about it.

But the distinction between procedural and substantive is not always clear and I will refer to a controversy that seems to have made an indelible impression on those who witnessed it. We had agreed to read Hobbes' Leviathan. The reason for doing so--although there are many reasons--is that Hobbes makes the fundamental case for respect for political authority as the alternative to a life that is, as everyone has heard, "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short." You can quarrel with this formulation, but it is close enough to remind you of what the general question is and, I need hardly remind you, of its special appropriateness for the world in the mid-sixties and of the opportunity it offers to bring the discussion of urgent questions from the street to the classroom. Whether you agree with him or not, Hobbes is formidable and worth, educationally, grappling with.

The Political Scientist was to do the introduction. Imagine my feelings as I heard him say that Hobbes was very powerful, an overpowering writer, but that his doctrine was pernicious. If you followed the first step, you would be trapped by the argument (not true, by the way). So you should not pay attention to what Hobbes says, but only notice his rhetorical artistry, read it as a literary critic would. But pay no attention to his argument; don't try to grapple with that. Instruction, in short, about how not to read a book we were supposed to read.

I, of course, rose to make an unplanned rejoinder--to the effect that the reason we were to read Hobbes was so that we would have to deal with an argument--a desperate message sent across three centuries from the midst of a terrible civil war--not to enjoy, unmoved, a literary and rhetorical gift. I may have lost my temper and revealed a small fraction of my contempt for the mind of an educator capable of making such a statement. I refrain, even now, from saying what I think. Well, the moment passed, but from that moment working in harness was impossible and we could, at best, barely tolerate each other's presence.

There are some lessons to be drawn from this episode. I begin with the reminder of the very oddity of the possibility of its occurrence. In the ordinary course of events he would be teaching his own course in the Political Science Department and he might or might not, at his discretion, include Leviathan and deal with it as he thought best. I would be teaching a course in the Philosophy Department, might choose to use Leviathan, and would deal with it as I thought best. We would neither know about nor be in a position to interfere with each other's conception of what to teach and how to teach it.

It could even be argued that with each free to follow his own professional judgment the best teaching would result. Certainly, there would be less conflict.

But in a Program, as distinct from a single-teacher course, certain problems force themselves onto the agenda. I can no longer continue to use, or use in a special way, the books that I, for some reason or other, find congenial or fruitful or simply reassuringly familiar. I must propose something to colleagues who have their own preferred lists. We must make a case for what we do; we will argue, sometimes bitterly, since the stakes are, in spite of superficial appearances, quite high. And we will have to decide, if we are to continue together and not settle for each going his separate way, about a significant range of educational problems that may seldom, in other circumstances, come in for serious consideration at all.

So that once the "private" course is abandoned the teacher finds himself in a transformed and problematic world, without familiar landmarks and accustomed usages, naked to his colleagues, forced to justify his conception of the teaching art and even to change his practice. The common Program is a cauldron for the brewing of educational insight, and I use this image fully aware of its evocation of Medea--some promise of rejuvenation, some destructive dissection, lots of heat. The difficulty is this: On the one hand, involvement in a common Program is the great device for forcing attention to the essential and neglected problems of education. On the other hand, collegial life in such a program can be so searing and demanding that one must doubt whether, except for a short time and by a happy accident, such a program can be institutionalized--except by heroic efforts and unusual commitment to a mode of educational life whose very point an outside observer is hardly likely to discern.

But I must turn to other matters--although there is more to be said about the virtues and difficulties peculiar to "programs" as against "courses." Curriculum! In my missionary years I used to point out that the Program had two distinguishable aspects: its non-course pedagogic structure and its completely required curriculum. I would make the point that the structure had its own virtues and could be adapted to a variety of situations and was not tied peculiarly to our curriculum. I thought, especially, that it would be easy and useful to try it for an upper-division departmental Major, unplagued by our special personnel and non-disciplinary features. And, of course, I had to grant that even for purposes of lower-division Liberal Education the world did not have to begin with *Iliad* and proceed through Greeks, Jews, and Englishmen to Henry Adams and Malcolm X as we were doing. The form did not entail any particular content. It did mandate a common required curriculum, but it did not require *this* particular one.

Nevertheless, I did and do have a special attachment to this particular one, although my defense of it has tended to be a bit diffident. In my eagerness to convince others of the virtues of the Program I might stress the structural pedagogic features and might even push my view that a liberal education required a broadly "political" curriculum--the cultivation of the sovereign mind. And although I would offer our curriculum as an example, I shied away from defending it as anything more than a contingent option. I was doing, in short, what we tend to do in academic life--avoiding argument about curriculum.

I tend to think (mistakenly) that "required," applied to "curriculum," is redundant; but in the world of the contemporary American college it is merely anomalous. If we must have requirements--from time to time we are shocked into saying we must have some--we try to have as few as possible. To the assertion that all students need this the rejoinder may be that they also need that and the other. You can't require too much so you must decide which. Everyone should certainly have a basic course in American History! Yes, and for that matter, in World History too. After all...it's terrible how we are turning out monoglotic English language chauvinists. Everyone should be required to master a second language! And how about Math? It's the language of science, and look at the Japanese! And our scientific illiteracy! And our computer illiteracy! And our literary illiteracy! And our ethnic ignorance! And our sexism! And can we really give anyone our degree without teaching some Economics? And isn't there something about Philosophy, or ethics or values...ah, yes, almost forgot that....

Obviously, we can't have everything and we can't easily agree about what to require, so we end up about where we are. We agree, shaking our heads sadly, that high schools should have prepared our students better, but now that they are here, apart from a bit of remedial work, we offer Freedom and Pluralism. That is, we offer our students "freedom" to choose, and justify our own irresponsible reluctance to impose requirements as "pluralism." A feeling of weariness steals over me as I face the prospect of arguing about that most dubious of freedoms, student elective freedom, about treating the student as a customer or a consumer who, presented with a rich catalogue containing a myriad of courses, is supposed to know what he wants or know what he needs. "Elective" should be a vacation, not a way of life.

Suppose we consider the tension, the interplay, between what a student chooses to do and what he is required to do in the course of his undergraduate college education--a more pervasive problem than is suggested by "electives" and "requirements." We may begin with the recognition that his very presence is an ambiguous mixture of freedom and necessity--of wanting to be there and having to be there if he wants to have a certain kind of life. It is important to recognize, that the normal American student is in college because it is the normal place to be at that time of life, not because he is driven by a thirst for the higher learning, by a desire to be a Professor, to spend his life within earshot of the bells of the Ivory Tower. His presence is "voluntary," but in a Pickwickian sense. Let us say then, that the student presents himself, enrolls in, chooses to enroll in, the College of Letters and Science still undecided, as he is permitted to be, about his or her "major" and subsequent career. What shall he study? Or rather, what courses should he take? What can he take? What must he take? What does he want to take?

The burden of choice is mercifully relieved by the existence of *some* requirements. If he has not already satisfied our minimal demands in language or mathematics he is encouraged to attend to such matters promptly, and to take the required course in Reading and Composition at once. But beyond this, dim visions of the future begin to make their demands. The decision about the Major (even about career and life) looms. Students will have to choose by the third year, and will discover that there are "prerequisites." That is, before they can be admitted to a particular Major, they will be expected to have taken some lower-division courses in preparation. By this device, some departments have come, with dubious legitimacy, to preempt almost half of a student's lower-division pre-major course life. And the danger of not knowing what you are going to major in is that when you do decide you may be delayed or prevented by lack of foresight about prerequisites. So, in addition to general requirements there are prerequisites to worry about--courses you must take first if you want to take something else. And it is often the case that if there is something you *want* to do there is also something you are required to do along with, in addition to, what you want to do. If you decide to major in Philosophy because you are interested in moral problems you will find that you have to struggle with Logic, which you may not be interested in at all. In fact, every major, in additon to the goodies that attract you, is likely to involve you in doing things you don't want to do, or at least think you don't want to do. (It is surprising how often we find that what we think we want to do turns out not to interest us after all, while what we think we are not interested in turns out to be very interesting.) And not only the Major, or the career for that matter, but any particular course will be a mixture of the chosen and the given, the wanted and the required. You choose a course because it involves X and find yourself willy-nilly also involved with Y.

All this is to induce some confusion about the chosen and the given, the elected and the required, in the realm of education. I do this in the hope of making what I want to say more palatable to readers for whom "freedom of choice" is a primary value. That is, that the significance of one's education depends less on the operation of student "choice" at every point than on the involvement of the student in coherent sequential activity imposed by the situation--a coherent sequencing that the student, by virtue of his status and condition--not by virtue of his sinfulness or folly--is generally unable to provide for himself, even aided by the misconceptions of his peers. The question, then, is not how much "choice" the student has--he will always have some--but what we provide in the way of coherent sequenced intellectual life within the framework of choice--within the structure of a single course or a loosely related sequence of courses, the structure of the upper-division Major, the structure of a Graduate or Professional School program. Obviously, only the first of these is available for the lower-division orphan. He has only courses. I used to say, when I was saying things like that, that a collection of coherent courses is still an incoherent collection of courses, and I would still defend my early description of the life of the lower-division student as, perforce, that of a distracted intellectual juggler.

So it was partly to remedy the fragmentation of attention and energy, especially in the lower division, that I developed the conception of a two-year

Program, that operated not by stringing unrelated or loosely related courses together but by abandoning the very conception of the Course and claiming and directing the bulk of the student's attention for the first two years. From the faculty point of view, this shift in unit involved the difference between planning a course--which every faculty member does routinely--and planning an education--which a faculty member is seldom if ever called upon to do. A Program makes such planning both possible and necessary and imposes a frightening responsibility on a faculty more accustomed to assuming responsibility for a Course and letting the Invisible Hand take care of Education.

The very conception of the Program as the significant educational unit called for a common required curriculum. And since, as I have said, the point of the enterprise was to provide something in the way of Liberal Education, the "content" was to be broadly and thematically "political." But thematic concentration, the determination to do a single thing at a time, had a price--the omission of many important things, and we were always worried by the price and, apart from our own doubts, had to defend ourselves against the charge that we were leaving out too many important things--especially science and mathematics. My own response was to grant the importance, regret the omission, insist that we were not going to do a number of different things in the Program, and invite the challenger to show us how science and mathematics could be integrated into the Program. I had, in fact, hoped that our mathematician would solve the problem and suggest appropriate changes. But his response to repeated prodding was something like, "No, not now...." I got a card from him during a later summer, from Greece where he had just enjoyed a performance of the Bacchae. A p.s. on his card excited me: "Have solved Program science problem!" When he returned, I was waiting. "What's the answer?" He seemed for a moment not to remember. Then to my baffled disgust, "Oh. Just add Prometheus Bound to the reading list."

No one else accepted the invitation, and I am convinced that it cannot be done. The catagories of "science" and of the "humanities" are radically different and irreducible to each other; they are simply different enterprises, both important, and you cannot do both at the same time without doing two different things at the same time. Of course mathematicians and scientists, who have a great capacity to make you feel guilty if you neglect them, were not inclined to worry about integrating important non-scientific matters into their teaching ("students should get that stuff elsewhere") and were prone, in those days, to throw C. P. Snow at you, who, having spoken of Two Cultures, liked to point out that whereas scientists were familiar with Hamlet, humanists were not equally at home with the Second Law of Thermodynamics. (Alas! No movie yet about the Second Law.) We hardly argue this issue anymore, partly because no one seems to be worrying about "integrating" anything into a coherent educational scheme.

But in those days I marshalled some sort of diffident defense, quite unconvincingly, hardly convincing myself. All sorts of people, including students, were sure we should be doing something else. I will not attempt a defense now. If you want me to, I'm in the phone book. I might say that it took me a long time to lose my sense of guilt about science and math--after all, they have "become death, destroyers of worlds"--clearly important. But a few years ago, drawn into recalling the past and giving an account of the Program to a convocation of professors, I was approached over a second drink by someone who introduced himself as a professor of Mathematics. "Why," he asked--not asked, really, but accused, "did you leave out mathematics?" "Mathematics?" I tried to raise my eyebrows. "Why not?" I replied. "It's not that important. They can take it somewhere else." He stared at me in shocked disbelief. But I felt liberated.

So we had, for students who "voluntarily" entered the Program, a completely required curriculum spanning two years--a relatively brief respite from a lifetime of discrete courses--relieving students of the problems of choice, imposing on the faculty the burden of creation. The starting point was the Athens-America conception that Meiklejohn had developed in the twenties at Wisconsin, but beyond that inspiration we went our own way, adding, as Matthew Arnold might say, the Hebraic to the Hellenic strain by dividing the first year between the Greeks and Seventeenth (more or less) Century England--the King James Bible, some Shakespeare, Hobbes, Milton, and on through Burke and beyond. The second year was to carry us into America--presenting interesting curricular challenges of greater difficulty. My own inclination was to focus on the Constitution, on Constitutional Law--a sort of Gentile variety of Talmudic studies--(since we are, more than most, a people of the Law Book and since most of our problems are transformed, sooner or later, into judicial questions), and Literature as the path to the understanding of the American situation, and if I had to do the Program again I would want to try to do that again, but better.

Still, I do not want, in this account, to reargue the curriculum, but only to say how it seems now upon reflection. What can you say about the Greeks, except that we are forever in debt to whoever brings our mind, with or without our consent, into engagement with Herodotus and Thucydides, Homer and Hesiod, Sophocles and Aeschylus, Plato...Greece seems almost to have been created for our enlightenment, and the Hellenic Testament, the story of its glory, its mind, and its self-destruction, the sad long day's dying, pervades any fortunate Western consciousness. Still, there are some things very close to us that are quite alien to the Greeks. I cannot imagine a Greek Job, and Job, with his anguished cry for Justice, is a pervasive echo in our lives. To study the Bible, Milton, and Hobbes is to take a second step towards self-knowledge. There are lots of things we didn't do, but what we did in the first year alone justifies the entire enterprise. Each new reading joined the thickening context of understanding, remaining permanently on the table, a permanent part of the mind. What I said in a daring moment in Experiment at Berkeley is quite true--that we had discovered a version of the basic moral curriculum of the West. I seem to be still studying it. I note, with some surprise, that the manuscript I am now completing, that I call The Burden of Office and think of more informally as Agamemnon and Other Losers, consists entirely of studies of Program readings.

Of course, neither the form nor the content of the Program was perfectly grasped at the outset. We learned as we went along. While the basic pattern was the same, there was significant difference between the first and second run. I have made no attempt here to be accurate about what happened when, to keep the two versions distinct. But we did have two attempts, two versions. It would be a bit misleading to say that the first program did not work the way I had intended and the second program did--although that is true enough. I shy away from saying that it didn't work the first time and did the second, as if we had one failure and one success. Some of the most interesting things happened the first time, and it may be that turmoil has its own special lessons. I have come to think of the two runs, as it seems convenient to call them, in terms of two of the novels of C. S. Lewis. Out of the Silent Planet tells of Tellus, our planet, where the Great Plan was frustrated by the rebellion in Eden. Perelandra tells of the planet on which the temptation was resisted and the Great Plan worked out as intended. Lewis allows us, invites us, to infer that wonderful as the Great Plan was where it worked in all its docile beauty, the story about where it didn't work as planned was perhaps even more wonderful still. At any rate, I think of the first run as Tellus, the second as Perelandra. I suffered through the first and I enjoyed the second, which was, in fact, wonderful as planned.

Two runs. If I had thought that the second would be like the first I would simply have written it off, called it off, not taken the necessary steps for a renewed attempt. But at the end of the second year of the first run the original faculty--those who had stayed on for the second year--returned to their normal pursuits. Two, as I mentioned, had signed on for only a single year. It was generally a happy parting, much relief on all sides at seeing the last of each other. But I was badly shaken. I had expected that the faculty, masters of their own classes, would have some problems working together, all teaching "our" students instead of each his own. I had expected a range of differing insights, a range of skills and backgrounds. What I had not expected was the raging vanity of the charismatic teacher. The competition of Scholars, the thirst for distinction, was a familiar and almost comical fact of academic life. But we encounter it, the vanity of scholars at a distance. You published your stuff; he published his; and when he excitedly waved the telegram announcing his award you would say (a famous episode), "What! You!" The scholarly community is diffused through the world, and you usually appeal to it in writing. Its vanity, although sometimes flagrant, is generally tolerable and not too greatly obstructive.

But the Teacher, the aspiring great teacher, is, in a perverted version, the seducer, the enchanter working his magic on a concrete local group. He must capture it, or he is nothing. He does not like to share the limelight; the presence of fellow professionals is intrusive and distracting; he is best at a one-man show; he worries about being upstaged or outshone. I think the conception of teaching as a "performing art" is deeply mistaken, but it is quite popular. And it makes cooperative teaching almost impossible.

Teaching is a subtle quasi-therapeutic art, not a performing art. It is very difficult to observe; it is not spectacular. There is really nothing much to see when you see a great teacher at work.... Oh, well, it is a commonplace at the University that we do not know how to really evaluate teaching--which may be why we rely so much on consumer reports. And, like other professions, we tend to close ranks at this point. Policemen are reluctant to condemn a colleague for unprofessional conduct; Lawyers hate to disbar lawyers; Doctors don't like to disqualify doctors. As for Teachers...we may say someone is a fine or great teacher, or a competent teacher, or a good teacher for small classes.... But we don't seem to even recognize a catagory of Harmful Teacher, of teachers who damage minds entrusted to their care. At this point we close ranks. Except, of course, when a common program destroys the isolation of the separate classroom and makes "harming your students" also a case of harming "ours" and impossible to ignore. Life in the isolated classroom is obviously simpler.

I blamed the troubles of the first run on my ineptitude in assembling its faculty. I may have been angry and nursed grudges, but I do not feel greatly justified in blaming my colleagues. They had, after all, merely accepted or succumbed to my invitation and were only doing what apparently came naturally. And I even felt guilty about knowing things about them that I would not have known except for the special circumstances of the Program, as if I had violated the privacy I had invited them to give up. Except for the Program, I would still, no doubt, consider some to be the strong teachers I thought they were when I recruited them, and it is unfair of me to first lure them out of their happy niches and then blame them for my disappointed expectations. I am slightly contrite.

But I was determined to give the Program another trial, and I tried a different approach to "staffing." I went outside the Berkeley faculty and called on friends, most of whom I had known since they were graduate students and I was an assistant professor. They were teaching elsewhere, but were able to get leaves to come to Berkeley for two years--to my rescue, to my delight.

This move, of course, raised some disturbing questions. Why could I not find regular Berkeley faculty willing and able to take part? Was I trying to establish a Berkeley Junior College below the dignity of what a now-defunct local paper referred to as the "U.C. Savant"? Did the Program, in that case, really belong on the Berkeley Campus? I was troubled by these questions, but I did not look very hard for another Berkeley staff. A perfunctory look turned up a few who were not uninterested, "but not just now." And I was not really interested in searching beyond the circle of those I knew, or thought I knew. I was quite exhausted and bruised and unwilling to spend the next two years rearguing basic principles and fighting centrifugal tendencies. I wanted colleagues who shared the vision, who understood the whole conception, who did not have local charismatic status to defend, whose educational background I had confidence in, who I thought I would enjoy working with, and who I considered to be first-rate minds and good teachers. Of those who came to my rescue, some had Berkeley tenure-equivalent credentials, a few were not in that particular race but had significant intellectual and pedagogic virtues.

The difference was striking. What made the difference? First, I suppose, I now had some experience and was aware of some of the things we needed to avoid. The importance of "constitutional" agreement was clear from the start--although I had thought it implicit even in the first run. The underlying rationale was more clearly formulated and was accepted as a constitutive condition of participation. But to say that is really to miss the main point: We were Friends, and not in a competitive situation. This is really an embarrassing point. I had thought the five of us in the first group were friends; so what was the difference? The most obvious was this: I had been a teacher of the core of the second group. They were in no sense "disciples" or even continuing students, but we had been through the mill together, and knew each other as only those who had been through that sort of mill together can know each other. Our essential mode was cooperative, not competitive. We argued--even quarreled--a lot, but we worked well together.

But the fact that I had surrounded myself with friends of this sort raises obvious questions. Could I not work in harness with contemporaries, only with those a generation younger? Was I taking advantage of the deference of former students? Was the whole search for collegiality really a self-centered hoax? I am, of course, bothered by the possibilty, and it would be unseemly and futile to protest too much, but let me at least say something. The basic agreement on fundamentals in the second group made possible a vigorous running disagreement on almost everything else. I was not treated gently about anything--especially about the ideas that ran like persistent threads through the two-year Program. And since I did not have to assume the role of Program defender I found myself dramatically less "central" to its life. I had, so to speak, specialized in defending the Program, and now that was a function shared by colleagues. I felt, for the first time, that I was one of a band of teachers and, when it came to that, I was not an especially good one. The others had, I thought, a better sense of the minds of our students, more devoted patience, better particular diagnostic flair and curative ingenuity and, oddly enough, a more single-minded devotion to the task. For the first time I had the feeling that I was not necessary, that the Program could get along without me, that I could relax and enjoy what we were doing. I was still, as the only regular Berkeley faculty member, responsible for whatever administration there was, and I was allowing myself to be drawn, marginally, into the turmoil distracting the campus (a turmoil that had surprisingly little effect on the Program). But the actual day-to-day life and work of the Program no longer depended on me. What stands out in my mind when I now think of the Program is the habit we, the faculty, fell into of having dinner together every Thursday night in a private room at the Faculty Club. I have mentioned that the attempt to do this on the first run collapsed after a single meeting. But for the two years of the second run we assembled every week over wine and dinner and argued for four or five hours. We had some fairly firm rules. We would not bring up any administrative matters. We simply had a discussion of the material we were reading in the Program, explaining, interpreting, arguing about the significance of this or that and, as the evening drew to a close, saying something like, "You two seem to be disagreeing about the central point, so why don't you each take twenty minutes or so to say what you think and get everyone launched at the Assembly next Tuesday, and we'll go on from there." Volunteering was frowned on; we were drafted for this or that service and found it very relaxing.

Often it seemed that the entire Program was a spill-over from this long-running seminar. We not only discussed the material substantively, we argued about how to use it. Looking back at the first run I would wonder how we could possibly have managed without the faculty seminar. The truth is, of course, that we didn't manage at all, and is only by virtue of the uncanny unspoilability of the basic material, the inherent fruitfulness of a dimly emerging pedagogic form and, perhaps, the notorious Hawthorne Effect that anything educationally useful emerged in spite of everything. But it was not Perelandra.

I remember the second run seminar as the most exciting, the most significant intellectual and moral experience of my whole life, unmatched, unapproached by anything I experienced in four decades of interesting University life, mostly at Berkeley which is, in many ways (was perhaps) an

Academic Heaven. The Seminar made the Program, and I am sure this judgment would be shared by everyone who took part in it.

I note that I have written far more about the first run and its traumas than about the second run and its triumphs. Obviously, the first shook me; the second renewed my faith. All my joy in recollection is focused on the second, all my anguish on the first. And yet I find myself writing nothing revealing about the quality of the triumph. It is easier to describe pain than health; easier, as Milton demonstrates, to write of Hell than of the joys of Heaven. Still, I am a bit startled to find how much the first run dominates this account, how little I do to communicate the quality of the second run. I do not intend to try to remedy that imbalance now, but only to acknowledge it.

I emerged after four years reassured that education could still be thought of as the initiation of the new generation into a great continuing and deeply-rooted civilization. But this, I suppose calls for some comment.

It was Berkeley in the middle and late sixties, one of the great centers of the generational uprising. The wave of baby boomers had broken over the college, a large cohort especially horizontally or peer group oriented. The times were stirring and troubled--the civil rights movement, sexual revolutions, the shocking end of Camelot, the war in Viet Nam loomed heavily on the horizon of those who, to the chagrined surprise of their elders, did not remember the Great War that had shaped and tempered the minds of parents and teachers. They did not remember Munich or Hitler or Pearl Harbor or D-Day or reading the headlines the day after Hiroshima, the surge of relief at calling off the million-corpsed invasion, the homecomings to triumphant and shattered worlds. They could not remember what their parents could not forget, their minds could never really meet--the one proud of the triumphant American expedition against the grim Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis, the other ashamed of the muddled, ambiguous American expedition to a strange periphery of Asia. But the parents saw them off to college and they arrived full of contempt for the world they never made, for racial and sexual injustice and hypocrisy, angry at having had to hide from the radiant fruit of science under schoolroom desks, enraged at the "unjust war" that had been doled out to them, without a confident religion, without a glowing political ideology--the scene was littered with fragments, with its own irreverent music, with the temptations of a shortcut to the expansion of consciousness, and armed somehow (God knows who taught them that!) with the powerful philosophical conviction that no one knew better than you what was right or good or even true "for you."

Only a vigorous imagination can begin to grasp the enormity of trying to initiate the class of sixty-something into an ongoing American branch of Western civilization. They gave us a house to try it in. It was the battleground, but I'm not sure everyone recognized what the battle was all about. It was to see whether our traditional cultural resources were powerful enough to withstand the contemptuous challenge of a despairing counterculture. I suppose that sounds grandiose. I think back to the House in its seedy disarray, half deserted, a handful of disgruntled students arriving for a dispirited seminar, or, again, to an argumentative throng, unexpectedly cheerful about something or other--a confusing sequence of disordered scenes. I am reminded of the scene in which Stendhal's hero, galloping away from a trivial bit of confusion, pauses and wonders, "Was that the Battle of Waterloo?" So, I ask myself, having crept away, was that really a battle in the war over the American soul? Without banners? Without a band? Yes, it was. Sometimes it seemed as if the world was struggling to turn itself into illustrative material to accompany the core curriculum of the Experimental Program. We were dealing, of course, with the themes that swirled about one of our greatest achievements--the creation and development of the great art of

Politics. To begin with the Iliad is to begin in medias res, in the midst of the perpetual war between the Human Expedition and the Human City, between the Quest and the Home. The tale is echoed or mimicked in the masterful account of the war to the death between Athens and Sparta, the paradigmatic cultures of the marketplace and the barracks, of freedom and of discipline. Against that background we grapple with the conflicting claims of Olympian rationality and Dionysian passion, with the elevation of Law over Fury, with the defiance of Law in the name of the Higher Law, with the great Platonic depiction of the parallel between Psyche and Polity ranging from the achievement of Wisdom to the reign of anarchy and tyranny in each. And then in the other of our great moods we contemplate the Covenant in the Wilderness on the road from Slavery to dreams of freedom, and ring a different set of changes on the problems of Authority, Obedience, Rebellion, War and Peace, Justice, Laws and Courts. And in the end, we come to see ourselves, to find ourselves, to know ourselves, as the present act in an ancient and perpetual drama....

So, in spite of everything, I emerged convinced that the traditional spiritual resources of the culture, far from being obsolete or exhausted, were, in fact, if we used them properly, the key to our salvation.

If we use them properly! And who, alas, is doing that? The natural University guardians of the great tradition are, of course, the Departments of the Humanities. But, with a few honorable exceptions, they guard the Treasure as Fafnir guarded his--they breathe fire if anyone tries to steal it, to use it, that is, without a license. Simply put, Departments in the Humanities believe in and practice scholarship. That is to say, they are not interested in what the people they study are interested in. They are interested in what scholars are interested in and, generally, the people they study were not scholars. ("...Lord what would they say/ Did their Catullus walk that way?) I respect what they know, appreciate what they do. I, who know not Greek, live on their scholarly translations. I read Dante and Virgil in translation; Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky in translation; Ibsen, even Goethe...I am parasitic on translators and scholars. I say a heartfelt "thank you." But they--"Humanists"--are obstacles to the non-scholarly human use of their work. They almost always vote against efforts like the Experimental Program. They usually consider people like me to be ignoramuses and dilettantes. They scare me (something easy to do to an emeritus professor who still thinks he was hired by mistake), but they kill significant liberal education. Fafnir! I would sooner turn the fate of liberal education over to Scientists who don't know what it is, but at least want it, than to "Humanists" who should know what it is, but are afraid of it. I am a bit surprised to find myself so bitter against such nice people, but I'll let it stand.... They, more than anyone, are responsible for the feeble state of liberal education in America.

But now I turn from the central curricular problem--I had intended to attempt an extended eloquent exposition of the curriculum but on reflection, I don't see why I should--to another pervasive aspect of the Program. Even as we were reading and arguing about freedom and authority we were also involved in an aspect of that problem as it colored the daily style of life in the Program. Let me begin with an anecdote. A few years ago, long after the Program had gone out of existence, I was invited to a reunion of graduates of Meiklejohn's Experimental College on the Madison campus. Meiklejohn had died, but the faithful still gathered. I was invited although I had not been one of them as a student, and I spoke to them about Meiklejohn's later years in Berkeley. At one general session a half dozen of the alumni (it seems strange to call them that) spoke in turn, reminiscing about life in the good old days in the Ex College. At the end, the chairman asked me, sitting enthralled in the audience, if I had any questions or wanted to say anyhting. "Yes," I said, "I have one question: Did you do your work?" Someone, a bit taken aback, launched a conventional affirmative reply but was interrupted by a tumult of denials. "No! No! Not a lick of work for two years! Too young! Too much freedom!..." It was a rather bitter outburst, a pent-up moment of truth, a half-century-old complaint. I actually do not remember whether I really said or only wish I had said what I do remember thinking, "Here we are honoring the memory of a man fired as President after bringing Amherst back to life, summoned to Wisconsin to create an educational utopia. He struggled against enormous odds, gathered a faculty, fought with the establishment, forged a novel curricular conception, investing a great mind and soul in the effort. And then you arrive, saunter off to taverns, and have the unmitigated gall to not do your work!"

Long before this episode, at one of the Program Thursday night final dinners devoted to a review of our problems, one of us launched into something like a complaint about how we were breaking our backs in our efforts while many students were just loafing. We were taping these review sessions (I still have the transcript). I am recorded as replying, "Doctors always work harder than patients." The transcriber unexpectedly notes, "Silence. And then laughter." Silence, and then laughter. What else?

There is a problem about freedom and coercion, impulse and habit, autonomy and shared ritual, in education as elsewhere. If we can state our objectives as the cultivation of certain habits of mind--whether stated grandiosely as the habit of rational inquiry and deliberation or more diffidently as the habits of careful reading, analysis, expression, discussion--we must decide about the uses of discipline in the process. It will come as no surprise that I not only believed in a required curriculum but that I also believed students should be required to do--should acquire the habit of doing--the work. But requiring something and getting someone to do what is required are two different things. The problem was to get our students to do what we thought they should do.

To begin with, for the familiar range of idealistic reasons, we denied ourselves the usual array of sticks and carrots. We decided not to have examinations or to give grades. The University had just begun to experiment with a pass/not-pass system and we were given permission to use it, stretching its limits a bit. Everyone whose performance did not merit expulsion from the Program was simply given a "pass"--a grade that would not enter into determining his subsequent grade-point average. No one was ever expelled from the Program for any reason other than serious performance delinquency. We put up cheerfully with intellectual inadequacy. I should say, on this score, that our students were good enough to have been admitted to Berkeley, but were not admitted to the Program on the basis of any special distinction. We did not want to run an "Honors" program; we wanted as typical a group as we could get and simply chose haphazardly from a large number of applicants.

There are situations in which there are examinations and grades and in which the student is told that he can do as he pleases about attendance and all that sort of thing. He will be tested and judged; how he prepares is his business. We were, I suppose, at the other extreme. There was no terminal exam to prepare for, no grade to certify anything. What we insisted on instead was that the student be there, with work at least more or less prepared. What we could not tolerate was no exams, no grades, and no "prepared" presence. Essentially, to stay in the Program meant to be there and to do one's work.

This choice of a mode of operation created many unfamiliar problems for us. The faculty had disarmed itself, put aside the usual disciplinary weapons. Non-attendance? We'll catch him on the Exam. Sloppy work? Do you want a C or D? It's all so easy, so familiar. We wanted something better and discovered the challenge, the difficulty, of developing other modes of intellectual motivation and student-teacher interaction. I had had a great skiing instructor whose diagnostic and instructional technique had impressed me as a paradigm of the teaching art. I tried to imagine him watching me turn my way down the slope and then saying, "C+. Next time try to ski better!" But I have seen instructors handing back a paper with the notation, "C. Try to write more clearly," and then arguing with the student about whether the paper really deserved a B.

We wanted something else. We wanted habitual prepared presence because nothing much could happen without that. But we wanted to improve the quality of intellectual activity. We wanted to find the useful thing to say about a student paper without--instead of--giving it a grade. We wanted to get the student to work harder and more fruitfully without the prod of grading. It was not easy and, at times, we wondered why we were making life more difficult for ourselves. But we persisted in the attempt to provide something other than extrinsic motivation for the exercise of the mind.

Students sometimes missed grades. One student announced that she was going to transfer out of the Program. She was a good student and, had there been grades, would have rated an A. She liked the work, she said, and she thought she was getting a lot out of the Program. And she really didn't mind just getting a "pass." But she couldn't stand the fact that her friend down the hall in her dorm wasn't doing much, was always going out on dates, and was getting a "pass" too. It wasn't right. "Would you like it better, would you stay, if you got an A and she got a C?" she was asked. "Of course!" she said, and departed for a fairer world.

Well, the path we chose required the insistence on a timely adherence to a sustaining common routine. But, from start to finish our performance was sporadic. The faculty had its Hawks and its Doves. Students defied expectations and it was difficult to do much about it. We could expel or threaten to expel, but that often seemed too drastic and was, from our point of view, an admission of failure. We hated to be reduced to nagging or disowning or, for that matter, to coaxing. Toward the end of the second run I began to entertain the heretical thought that we should reconsider the abandonment of grades. Grades don't really bother the good student; they serve as a prod to the middling; they provide retribution to the delinquent. I expressed my doubts to my second-run colleagues and was thoroughly raked over the coals. They are probably right; grades are a second-best device for a second-best world. It no doubt reveals my condition when I confess that the issue does not seem to me as important as it once did.

Meiklejohn, I believe, was more tolerant of student "independence" or "non-performance" than I was, and I was inclined to think he might have been out of sympathy with the spirit in which I was approaching the problem--that a late paper or missed lecture was not a minor failing but a sign that one's life was fundamentally out of control. Some students thought so too. The reproach pinned to the wall, "Joe, Joe, what have you done to my idea?", signed "Alec", was, no doubt, a forgery, but, I was prepared to concede, not a bad one. Meiklejohn, I believe, had had--had been required to have--grades.

But whatever the verdict about grades as a motivational and disciplinary device, I am not in retreat at all from the view that a college, a Program, a community of learning is not a collection of individuals each pursuing his own firefly, but a company taking thought together, sharing a common life, a common discipline, a common ritual. I suppose I prefer the fellowship of the Round Table to the solitary quest for the Grail.

Towards the end of the second run a committee of the College of Letters and Science looked into what we were doing and made a recommendation that eventually resulted in the College's giving its approval to the Program on its academic merits while, at the same time, expressing the cautious view that continuation would depend on the availablity of fairly scarce resources. I was pleased, since all I wanted at that point was academic approval. I did not know how much was generally known about our internal storms. Our students were also involved, to different degrees, in the campus life of the time. I remember being strangely pleased when, during a general student strike they would show up for work, announcing that they were on strike against the University but not, obviously, against us. The Student Movement was leaving us in peace, practicing benign neglect. I knew some of the leaders, and while I was almost always opposed to what the Movement was doing on campus I was not terribly active in the fight. On the educational front, it was generally known that I held to the reactionary view that the faculty was to govern education (my burden was that I defended the faculty's authority even while I despised the way the faculty exercised it) and that I had scant sympathy for student participation in curricular matters. As a matter of principle this was anathema to the Movement, and they could not embrace the Program as a step in the right educational direction. On the other hand, the Program was at least a radical innovation and an expression of the University's concern with undergraduate education. So the Movement neither supported the Program nor opposed it. I welcomed being left alone and would not really have known what to do with student "support," would have been embarrassed by it.

The University faculty, initially a bit apprehensive that I was launching an undisciplined educational spree, seemed reassured by rumors that I was really trying to run a sort of boot camp. An unexpectedly candid report I wrote after the first year evoked many expressions of appreciation and good will, and by the time we were well into the second run I felt that the faculty was amiably tolerant, although far from accepting the validity of fundamental conceptions underlying the Program.

The Administration--at least in its higher ranks--continued to be supportive (although I was aware of some hostility at the Decanal level). We were receiving favorable national publicity as educational innovators, somewhat offsetting the charge that the University was involved in research to the neglect of undergraduate teaching. Even some Regents, at one of whose meetings a prominent member had, before we were launched, criticized us as planning to teach (incite?) Revolution and had demanded, in vain, a letter supporting Free Enterprise from each of the Program faculty, were, informally, offering encouragement.

In short, as we neared the end of the second run the auspices for continuation were generally favorable and I welcomed the academic approval of the College as a minor vindication and as a necessary precondition of a move from "experimental" to "regular" status. But I was undecided about what to do. The past five years had been exhausting and I needed some leave. The Program faculty needed to return to their regular positions elsewhere. Continuing meant gathering a new faculty, and while some of the second run faculty were perfectly capable of running the Program and were willing to continue they could not simply stay on without resolving ambiguities about permanence that could not, at that stage, be resolved. I realized that to have a break in continuity would be to lose some momentum, but I did not have the heart to scramble to put together a third trial run. Two experimental runs was enough, I thought, and now the University should make a decision about permanence and, if it wanted the Program, settle upon the basic conditions of its existence. (A canny "institution builder" might have tried to prolong the trial period indefinitely....)

For the student of institutional reform the situation was not without interest. I see it now as an encounter between the enduring and the ephemeral. The enduring University is rooted in Departments, themselves based on the great cognitive disciplines that, over time, may merge and split, slowly altering the geography of the mind. But the basic fact of modern University life is the Department; the faculty members' home is the Department. That being said (and this is an oversimplification) we will have to recognize that the University will also seem to be a great collection of Institutes, Schools, Colleges, Centers, Programs.... Some of these may be quite enduring, but they are administrative modes that facilitate the trans-departmental activities of Department members. Such activity may be quite important, exciting, fruitful, opportunistic, and the non-departmental organization enables the University to respond to challenges and opportunities without having to endure frequent or traumatic fundamental restructuring. The key to the relation between the enduring and the ephemeral is the institution of Tenure. And Tenure is something you have (with a few ignorable exceptions) in Departments.

This, then, was the context in which the question of the future of the Experimental Program presented itself. Should it, could it, how could it move across the line that separated a trial venture from a regular more or less "permanent" part of the University? Let me say, to begin with, that the University--the great ponderous soulless "multiversity" of popular caricature--had shown, in my case, remarkable openness and flexibility. As a professor, I had presented to the University, from the back benches, a radical educational proposal and within a year the Program was in existence. During that year I was teaching a full load of courses in Philosophy and serving as Chairman, so that arguing for, planning, and launching the Program was essentially a spare-time activity. It was an adventure, but the real point is that the University listened, smiled faintly, nodded, made a slight adjustment in the distribution of its resources (nothing much--perhaps a million or so) and said, "Go ahead!" Now, four years later it said, "Not bad," and waited for me to make the next move.

But while the University had been flexible and hospitable, I had done nothing to get the Program rooted in Berkeley's soil. The first run Berkeley faculty had returned to their Departments and had no continuing connection with the Program. The visiting second run group had gone home. I was left, panting, in my home department. Where was the Program? Who cared? The House, unused, was, by a delicate act of University courtesy, held for my decision until I relinquished it. But I had no working colleagues on the scene and was uncertain about what to do. On the one hand, the prospect of continuing to work in--to live within, really--a Program with colleagues like those in the second run was very appealing, although I liked normal academic life also. On the other hand, the tangle of problems and decisions that loomed over the path to permanence--and as I said, I would not do another trial run--was daunting. But overshadowing personal considerations, although intertwined with them, was my loyalty to the idea of the Program as a great educational form and the sense of guilt that overwhelmed me at the thought that the Program might go out of existence because I lacked the energy or ingenuity to keep it going.

Everything was in limbo when I got a call from a newly appointed Vice Chancellor. He had himself been appointed by a newly appointed Chancellor. (Chancellors were ephemeral in those days. This was our third or fourth in about as many years.) The message was that the new Chancellor wanted me to continue the Program. Would I draw up a proposal? So I drew up a modest proposal. A Program to start each year with about 150 students and six professors in each group. I suggested that three of the faculty were to be permanent, tenured, faculty who understood and were committed to the Program and who could guide the three transient faculty members and provide stability and experience. In addition to thus keeping the Program in existence and available on a modest scale for Berkeley students, I wanted, by inviting the right visiting faculty, to foster imitation by State and Community Colleges for whom such a lower-division program might be a boon. And finally, I proposed that we undertake to become a center for the study of higher-education teaching, the absence of which had seemed to me to be a scandal not mitigated by Schools of Education. I gave the three-page proposal to the Vice Chancellor and within a very short time he told me that the Chancellor was sold on the idea and wanted me to go ahead. So, what did I want? What should we do?

I was not surprised that the Chancellor wanted the Program. I thought any educator in his right mind would want it. It was inexpensive, unobtrusive, daringly innovative, serious, highly regarded throughout the country and even abroad, worth its cost in public relations alone--to say nothing of the real point, that it was a great educational program. I agreed to go ahead and got down to cases with the Vice Chancellor. He was a very engaging young man, apparently marked for high administrative positions. But at that time he seemed to me to be quite naive about the academic facts of life, not knowing what was easy and what was difficult, not knowing the score, hardly knowing what the game was. But enthusiastic.

I went to the heart of the matter quickly. There was only one thorny problem: faculty. We would need a skilled cadre. I could not do it alone. I would need colleagues. I already had three in mind, all of whom held tenure positions at their own very respectable institutions. I had taught with them and knew they were very good. I could probably induce them to come. But I would only invite them if I could offer them tenure. So besides myself I would need three to five tenure slots. Everything else was easy. I think my request seemed reasonable to the Vice Chancellor. He raised no objections, and said I'd be hearing from him.

But I did not hear from him for quite a while. I did not expect to. I thought he would be discovering the difficulties in the way of capturing tenure slots. Hard-nosed Deans might not make a fuss about temporary Programs they did not believe in, on "soft" money. But tenure slots were a different proposition. They were precious, and departments fought over them. Their assignment determined the fate of Departments and the shape of the University's future. Toleration for an ephemeral maverick program was one thing; giving away tenure slots was quite another. So I waited, knowing the Vice Chancellor would be encountering static. As the personnel deadline approached I indicated that I needed a decision. Eventually the Vice Chancellor informed me, with some irritation, that he was not going to turn over a half dozen tenure slots for me to dispose of as I wished (not that I had put the request that way). I did not argue, and the deal was off.

But this was rather uncharacteristic of me. I had not, in the course of establishing and running the Program, acquired the habit of taking "no" for an answer. So why did I not try to go around the Vice Chancellor, or over his head, to the Chancellor, or even the President, as I had been prepared to do in the past when necessary? That is an interesting question, and when I try to put my finger on the crucial point at which the Program lost its life it comes to rest here. Not with the denial of the tenure slots, but with my decision not to fight the denial--even though, in the end, I might have lost that fight. It was convenient for me to explain, when I was asked, as I frequently was, why the Program went out of existence, that the University was unwilling to assign the necessary tenure positions. That answer, while true enough, sounds as though I am placing the blame on the University, on the Vice Chancellor or on the lesser Satraps who were stiffening his spine. They were, no doubt, formidable adversaries, but not as formidable as my own doubts that paralyzed me at what might have been the moment of battle.

My own doubts. I could not solve the tenure question, in principle, to my own satisfaction. As I have mentioned, tenure was only granted to people in departments and on the recommendation of departments. Two of the people I had in mind held tenure positions in their own Philosophy Departments. Should I approach the Berkeley Department with the proposition that they should take on my candidates as tenured members of the Philosophy Department, grant them indefinite leave to teach in the Program with the option of deciding, at any time, to teach philosophy courses instead? The Department had, in fact, recently gone through a bitter battle about such a case, and I knew how hopeless such a request would be had I the gall to make it. I won't elaborate on the complexities of this situation, but it was clear to me that I could not hope to plant the Cadre in various Departments, enjoying, as absentees, the privileges of Tenure.

The alternative was to consider tenure without departmental status--an almost self-contradictory notion. We now have a few "University Professors" whose tenure may transcend departments and even a particular Campus, but in those days they had not yet been invented, and they were not designed for our situation. So how about simply pressing for tenure in the Program as a justified novelty? I thought of it, of course. But first, who knew how long the Program would last. And if it terminated, tenure would not persist like the grin of a Cheshire cat, it would vanish with the Program. But besides the risk that I was unwilling to invite others to assume it was not at all likely that the highest University authorities would approve some form of non-departmental organization supporting tenure appointments.

And if, in spite of the odds, it did--and this was the crushing difficulty, the one I never discussed but that weighed on my mind--I was not sure that I would want it or could recommend it. I knew how intimate and abrasive life in the Program could be. I thought it very likely that sooner or later friends would fall out, would disagree in ways that would make working togther impossible, might get fed up with each other or with the Program, or with students at less than arm's length, or would, in sheer exhaustion over the toil of collective life, yearn for the healing privacy of a course of one's own. A yearning we could not satisfy in the Program. I was not unaffected by the falling out among friends in the first run, and was even more troubled by the fact that in the second run, in spite of my caution, I had invited a friend who became so upset by his disagreement with the rest of us about how to teach that he soon withdrew in embittered rage from communication and interaction and was a dead weight for almost two years. We were stuck with him because I had invited him for two years and he had taken leave, etc. Suppose he had tenure? This experience points up the virtue of departments. A department member does not have to get along with anyone. He can despise his colleagues to his heart's content. He need have nothing to do with them. And he can get on with his teaching and research as he pleases. Tenure in that made sense; but tenure in a Program? I was baffled. Tenure was necessary. Tenure in departments was not in the cards. Tenure in a program alone worried me. I anguished over the problem. I considered all the things you are now about to suggest. But baffled I remained.

And I was unnerved by other doubts, not about others, about myself. Life in the Program, especially during the second run, was enormously exciting, and I was really willing to do it again. But why was I so exhausted? I remember one day in the first run when, late in the afternoon, as I was settling down to some task, I saw our Mathematician sauntering towards the door. I must have sent him a reproachful look because he turned back to me. "I know what you're thinking," he said, "but let me tell you something. I do all my work, all the reading, attend everything, meet my seminars, confer with my students. But I'm not going to overwork like you. I'm going to work the way a Professor should work. This is an educational experiment, but if it can only work if the Professors overwork, the experiment is a failure. You're working too hard.

I'm not going to, and I'm right...." He was right, of course. I did work too hard. I realize that the work of establishing a new Program was far greater than the work involved in teaching in an established, ongoing enterprise, that life in a continuing Program would get a bit easier. But at the very least, teaching in the Program was a heavy full-time job, whereas, at Berkeley, teaching was considered only part of a Professor's work. He was supposed to be doing scholarship, research, writing as well, and his relatively light teaching load reflected that fact. Was I to become a full-time teacher? I didn't really want to, although I was devoted to teaching. I wanted--should I be ashamed to say?--to live the life of a normal Berkeley Professor. Sometimes, during the Program, I would cross the campus to see old cronies at the Faculty Club. I was like a harassed mother who had escaped her demanding brood for an adult lunch break. I felt the seductive charm of "normal" academic life--the intellectual tension, the pervasive wit, the intellectual privacy, the leisurely autonomy, the cool arm's length, controlled, well-mannered involvement, on one's own terms, with others. I missed it, and I shrank from the thought of giving it up for the unremitting intensity of life in the Program. And if I felt that way now.... Well, these were secret thoughts, unsharable, treasonous. Was I really prepared to wrestle endlessly with the recalcitrant for their own unrealized good or to live the life of a missionary in a corner of a gaudy Rialto? The very question was enervating, demoralizing.

So, when the Vice Chancellor told me there would be no tenure slots I did not argue. I did not spring into battle in order to face, if I won the battle, a problem for which I had no solution. Perhaps it was simply weariness. Perhaps something was operating at a deeper level, something which I have no desire to understand. I let it go. But now, wher I think about the Program's failure to graduate from "ephemeral" to "enduring," in spite of its unique quality, I do not blame the University, I blame myself.

The fundamental delusion may have been to suppose that it was possible for a great organism like the University to nourish or sustain for long an enterprise at odds with its essential nature. The mode of life required by the Program was not congenial to the normal Berkeley professor, violating the basic assumption that one teaches what one is expert at, as one thinks best. Experts teaching their subjects to students who want to study it is our ideal condition--the best experts and the best students. Some requirements, some structured sequences. Courses, courses, courses--the established American pattern of schooling producing, not infrequently, the tough, provocative course that lingers almost alone in the fond memories of Alumni. The pattern common to Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Berkeley, Swarthmore, Oberlin, Wesleyan, Amherst, Smith, Michigan, Wisconsin, Columbia, Fresno State, Ohio State, and almost everywhere else. It is easy. We know how to do it. It may not be all that good, but it cannot be all that bad. It has, after all, made us what we are. So it is not surprising that our basic pattern persists, taking ephemeral challenges in stride. A daring young President summoned Meiklejohn to Wisconsin and gave him some running room for five years before the weight of the patient regular faculty prevailed and the Experimental College vanished. Hutchins, with great energy and flair, created his College (not really all that radical) at the University of Chicago and, as he told me ruefully, the University proceeded to dismantle it as soon as he left. Scott Buchanan and Stringfellow Barr launched St. John's on its significant path and it is still alive after half a century. But it is not a part of a University; it stands apart, a church served by its own devoted priesthood. The University of California's Santa Cruz campus flirting initially with a "college" organization and, never trying anything terribly different, becomes more normal every year as the Department, under a different name, increases its dominance over the college. The fact is, our prestige institutions are content to be what they are--course-givers with, perhaps, a few local variations. The key is, of course, the Faculty. It is what it is, not something else. It does what it does best, and it is hard to get it to do anything else, and perhaps unreasonable to try. Meiklejohn and Hutchins tried to do different things with specially recruited faculties living as second-class citizens within the domain of the regular faculty. St. John's does different things, but with a "different" faculty and lives beyond the mainstream. Santa Cruz wanted to do different things, not really knowing what they were, but it wanted to do them, as I learned when I was asked to serve on committees, with a Berkeley-style faculty. In the Program at Berkeley I wanted to avoid the "second-class citizen" problem by getting some Berkeley faculty to act differently, and ended up in the war of the first run. For the second run I gathered a non-Berkeley faculty that did different things brilliantly, but I could not solve the problem of turning them into Berkeley faculty.

The nature of the faculty sets limits to the possibilty of "reform"--taking "reform" to mean not mending one's evil ways but rather reshaping the structure of learning and teaching (and, of course, the better the faculty the more difficult it is to expect it, or even ask it, to change its ways). Within our conventional limits we hail as innovative the establishment of the great course. It can be a course in Western Civilization, or in Great Books, or Integrated Humanities or Integrated Social Science, or American Civilization, or Citizenship, or World Culture.... Each is an attempt, frequently successful, to mitigate fragmentation and excessive specialization, to provide some integration and perspective. They are usually founded by the vision and energy of a powerful faculty member and persist, even with diminishing elan, as cherished and distinctive features of the institution. Birth by committee is, I believe, rather rare, but I am not opposed, a priori, to miracles. Beside the special course and the addition of new courses the educational change generally compatible with the basic structure is tinkering with requirements and sequences, sometimes sparked by genuine educational considerations, sometimes by political pressure triumphant, even, over responsible faculty qualms. To a disappointed or frustrated idealist like me these minor matters are barely worth the candle substantively but may be grimly amusing to observe as they reveal the interplay of intelligence, habit, power, of self-interest, ignorance and irresponsibilty in the conduct of affairs in a great institution.

Well, in the immortal words of Edith Piaf, I regret nothing. It was worth doing. For many of us, it was a uniquely great educational experience. I am proud of the exasperating ephemeral now-vanished child. The House is still there, and, as I said, when I drive past it now nothing happens. Almost nothing. The other day as I drove by, a small drama from the past popped into my mind. I had walked in at about 7:00 a.m. No one was there. I looked with distaste at the disorder, the weary furniture, the carelessly strewn objects. Then I stared in irritation at the enormous poster, the head of Dylan (Bob, not Thomas), lording confidently over the Great Hall. Unavoidable, dominating. It had annoyed me for weeks. On a reckless impulse I stood on a chair, unpinned the poster, rolled it up and carried it off to my office. Some hours later an indignant young man stomped in. "What happened to my picture?" I looked at him coolly. "I took it down." "Why did you take it down?" It was not really a question. I parried with, "Why did you put it up?" "I put it up," he said, contemptuous in advance of an assertion of authority, "because I felt like it!" "I took it down," I said, "because I felt like it." He stood silent for a rather long moment. Finally he nodded. "Fair enough," he acknowledged, reached for his poster, and left with the head of Dylan under his arm. Whim baffles whim. The memory of that small triumph of reason warms me.

In the end, the Program must be judged to have made no enduring difference to the quality of education at Berkeley. The sea of normal life has closed over the sunken hope, the surface now unbroken, the depths unvisited. I have never been tempted to launch a salvage operation or to get back into the educational wars, since, apart from other reasons, I seldom see a banner raised that seems worth repairing to--only trivial proposals, not worth fighting for, not worth opposing. And I have had my chance.

When I look back at the Program through the haze of present distance, ignoring the details of small triumphs and small tragedies, banking the glow of old animosities, stilling regret over misplays or false moves, several things stand out. First, the struggle to achieve something of a working intellectual community--a group of faculty and students engaged in a common enterprise, creating a structure of ritual and habit triumphant over the impulses of disintegration--an intellectual community as a way of life, sustained for a significant period of time. It was, in a world of discrete, self-contained, autonomous classrooms a glimpse, a reminder of the quality of a Pre-Babelian world. That glimpse of community is, perhaps, the most dominating of all my memories.

And second, the curricular conception--the attempt to provide for our present crises the cultural context within which they are to be understood. Something has happened when you can grasp the thread that runs from _Orestes_ and _Antigone_ to West Virginia v. Barnette and the Presidential campaign of 1988. When you can see that the attempt to impose the Tablets of the Law upon the worshippers of the Golden Calf is the same struggle as is involved in our attempts to make the Constitutional Covenant and the Law prevail over our hedonic impulses and narrow partialities. The failure to provide this great context is to send our students naked, robbed of their proper clothing, of their proper minds, into the jabbering world. It is stupidly irresponsible of the University to allow this to happen. It is a betrayal of its trust. It is, as I used to say, a consequence of the fact that the University, simply by being what it is, has killed the College.

These convictions, with which I began, survive in me unimpaired, although shadowed now by frustration and defeat.

Appendix E

Experimental College Study
Interview Schedule

ntervw.sch
raft11:05 10-89 ge
isk302

EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE STUDY
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What has been the major impact of the Program on your life?

2. How did you come to apply to the Program? What appealed to you about it?

3. Did anyone support your entering the Program?

4. Where did you go to high school?

5. How well did you feel your high school background prepared you for the Program?

6. Do you think that having been well or poorly prepared increased the value of the Program for you? Do you think you would have benefitted more if you had been better or less prepared?

7. Did you experience any kind of "culture shock" when you first entered the Program?

8. Did you see entering the Program as taking a kind of risk?

9. How was the Program similar to what you expected, and how was it different?

10. At the time, how did you feel about the various features of the Program:

    Lectures
    Seminars
    The "Unattended" Seminar
    The Readings
    Papers
    The Journal
    The Intellectual Biography
    Individual Conferences with Faculty
    Relationships with Faculty
    Relationships with other Participants
    The House
    Retreats

11. Now that you look back over time, have your views on any of these changed over time?

12. Did you experience a sense of "community" in the Program? Elsewhere in the University?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

13. Were there any rewards or benefits to you of participation in the Program? What were you getting out of it at the time?

14. What would you have said you were learning at the time? How?

15. Were there any real costs or disadvantages to you of being in the Program--either that you felt at the time or since?

16. When you first entered the Program, did you ever worry about had you made the right choice? Did you ever consider dropping out? Do you believe now you made the right choice?

17. While you were in the Program, could you describe your most predominate feeling about it: boredom, fear, excitement, enthusiasm, anger, indifference, confusion, or anything else?

18. Did you strongly identify with the Program; or was it just another way to complete you lower division requirements; or did you feel rather alienated from it?

19. Did you identify with or greatly admire any of the faculty? Have you stayed in touch with any of them

20. How important to your education were other students in the Program? Did you often talk with any of them about the readings, seminars, issues, etc.?

21. Have you stayed in touch with any of them over time

22. What about relations with other U.C. students

23. What was your judgement of your academic abilities as a high school graduate?

24. Did participation in the Program change the way you felt about yourself academically?

25. Did that change or remain the same in your upper division years

26. Did you ever feel you were part of any kind of intellectual "elite"?

27. How do you think being in the Program had an affect on your
ability to write?
critical reasoning skills?
your ability to argue effectively?

28. There was a great deal of political activity on the campus during your time there. Were you involved in any way? Did your membership in the Program affect your participation in politics, on or off campus, at the time?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Can you recall the most important changes you were undergoing during your time in the Program (changes in your intellectual or academic interests or goals, your political interests, in your maturity, etc.), and do you think the Program had any part in those changes?

There were apparently some themes important to the Program. I am interested in you attitudes toward them then, and now. What was your attitude toward "authority" when you entered the Program? Did you object to the "giveness" of the requirements? Did the Program have any effect on your attitudes towards authority at the time?

What about your attitude toward "freedom and responsibility"? Did that change in response to the Program?

Can you say something about the relationship of the Program to the rest of your university life? What was the transition like when you entered the upper division? (classes, faculty, grades, papers, examinations, peers?)

Did you have problems of any kind switching from the Program to the regular university?

When you entered the upper division, did you feel prepared for the academic work?

How did you compare yourself with other upper division students who had not been in the Program?

What did you decide to major in?

How did you come to make that decision? When?

Was your experience in the Program a factor of any importance in your choice?

Can you think of any major life decisions you have made, say about your career, family life, political commitments, religious affiliation (do you have any sense that the way you learned to think in the Program had any bearing on the way you made this decision?

When did you graduate?

Do you remember your GPA?

What did your do after graduation? And up to now?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

43. What work do you do now?

44. Has your work been any different as a result of your having participated in the Program?

45. Have you gotten anything from the Program in subsequent years that you haven't mentioned so far?

46. Has the Program had any effect on other parts of your life (cultural interests, social, civic and political participation or attitudes)?

47. Because of your participation in the Program, did you feel there was something special expected of you? Was there some kind of ideal you felt you should live up to? And do you still feel that way? Did you feel you achieved that ideal?

48. How has your life been different in any way as a result of being in the Program?

49. Do you have any regrets about having been in the Program?

50. Would you do it again?

51. Would you change it in any way?

52. What was the most significant intellectual experience you've ever had?

53. Do you have anything you want to add?

54. Are there any other questions you think I should be asking?

55. What did you think of the interview?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix F

College Attitudes Study Questionnaire

COLLEGE ATTITUDES STUDY

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. From what kind of secondary school did you graduate? (check one)

______Public
______Private (nondenominational)
______Private (denominational)
______Other

2. What was your average grade in secondary school? (check one)

___A or A+
___A-
___B+
___B
___B-
___C+
___C
___D

3. What were the major sources of financial support during the *first year* of your undergraduate education? (check as many as apply)

___Personal savings and/or employment
___Parental or other family aid
___Repayable loan
___Scholarships or grants
___Other

4. What was the highest level of formal education obtained by your parents *at the time you entered U.C.*? (check one in each column)

	Father	Mother
Grammar school or less	____	____
Some high school	____	____
High school graduate	____	____
Some college	____	____
College degree	____	____
Post-graduate degree	____	____

5. What is the highest academic degree you now hold?

Degree_______________ Major or field________________ Year earned_______

6. (Please indicate the extent of your agreement with each item below by writing the appropriate number next to it.)

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree with reservations
3. Disagree with reservations
4. Strongly disagree

Undergraduate education would be improved if:

____ All courses were elective.
____ Grades were abolished.
____ Course work were more relevant to contemporary life and problems.
____ More attention were paid to the emotional growth of students.
____ Students were required to spend a year in community service in the U.S.
____ There were less emphasis on specialized training and more on broad liberal education.

7. Taken all in all, how satisfied were you with your undergraduate education at Berkeley? (check one in each column)

	Lower Division	Upper Division
Very satisfied	____	____
Satisfied	____	____
Neutral or mixed feelings	____	____
Disatisfied	____	____
Very dissatisfied	____	____

8. When you entered U.C. Berkeley, how well prepared did you feel you were compared to most other students in your classes? (check one)

____ Better prepared than most
____ About as well prepared as most
____ Not as well prepared as most

9. And when you entered the upper division at Cal? (check one)

____ Better prepared than most
____ About as well prepared as most
____ Not as well prepared as most
____ Did not enter upper division

10. Were there any professors at Cal: (check "yes" or "no")

	Lower Division		Upper Division	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Whom you felt free to turn to for advice on personal matters?	____	____	____	____
Who took special interest in your academic progress?	____	____	____	____
Who had a great influence on your academic career?	____	____	____	____

11. (Please indicate the importance to you of each item below by writing the appropriate number next to each.)

1. Essential
2. Fairly important
3. Not important

People want different things from college. How important was it to you to get each of the following when you were at Cal?

____ A detailed grasp of a special field.
____ A well-rounded general education.
____ Training and skills for an occupation.
____ Learning to get along with other people.
____ Formulating the values and goals of your life.

12. How would you characterize yourself politically while at Cal and now? (check one in each column)

	While at Cal	Now
Left	____	____
Liberal	____	____
Middle of the road	____	____
Moderately conservative	____	____
Strongly conservative	____	____

13. When you graduated did you feel you had been in charge of your own education at Berkeley, or that you were more or less part of an educational "machine"? (check one)

____ I felt I had been in charge of my own education.
____ I felt that I had been part of an education "machine".
____ In between; some of both (explain)

14. What is your birthdate? ______ month ______ date ______ year

15. What is your occupation? ____________________

16. What is your ethnic background? ____________________

17. What is your religious background? ____________________

18. Your gender: ___Male ___Female

19. Finally, can you describe briefly your most significant educational experience?

Appendix G

College Attitudes Study Report

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

CENTER FOR STUDIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION   BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

June 19, 1991

Dear Respondent:

During the summer and fall of 1989 you filled out and returned a questionnaire that was part of a study of the Experimental College Program. Some of you who had completed the Program were interviewed on your recollections of it as well. Another group of people who had been Program participants but who were not available for interviews (mostly because of geographical distances) also completed questionnaires. The data from the questionnaires have now been collected and analyzed and will become one part of the final report of the study.

The main purpose of the questionnaire was to determine if former students who had applied to the Program were significantly different in background from other entering freshmen at U.C. Berkeley during the years 1966 and 1967 (there was no information for freshmen from 1965.) The data also provide us with some clues as to the difference in attitudes toward college held by those who completed the Program as compared with those applicants who were not admitted in the random selection process. In addition, there is some information on differences between Program participants who entered in 1965 and those who entered in 1967.

In brief summary, the data tell us that students who applied for entry to the Program, whether or not they were accepted, were on the whole a somewhat more confident, academically better prepared group than their classmates who entered the "other University." Program applicants were somewhat more likely to have gone to a private school than the other UCB freshmen (19% vs. 11%); more likely to have had an A- or better grade point average in high school (58% vs. 38%); and had mothers who were college graduates or had gone to graduate school (45% vs. 32%). And as we know from the literature, the education of parents, and especially of mothers, is a decisive factor in how much and what kind of formal education children have. (Indeed, it is worth noting how well educated the parents of Berkeley entrants were in the mid-60's: fully 70% of the fathers of the regular Berkeley entrants, and 80% of the fathers of Program applicants, had had some years of college.)

There are few other demographic factors which would distinguish the Program applicants from ordinary applicants. One is religious background: where only 13% of ordinary entering freshmen came from Jewish backgrounds, nearly a third of Program applicants were Jewish, a pattern duplicated in the self-selection to other innovative and challenging educational programs in the United States and abroad.

In comparing the Program applicants with the other entering freshmen at UCB, we were restricted to a small number of comparable questions. But when we compare the Program attendees with the Program applicants who were not accepted, we are comparing their responses to the same questionnaire, which gives us a somewhat larger range of comparisons. And here the most striking findings are the assessments by the two groups of aspects of their lower and upper division education at Berkeley. For example, when asked how satisfied they were with their undergraduate education at Berkeley, with an opportunity to reply separately for the lower and upper divisions, the effects of the Program are clearly visible more than 20 years later. Half the Program attendees report that they were "very satisfied" with their lower division experience, as compared with only 21% of non-Program attendees. By contrast, only 22% of the Program participants said that they had been "very satisfied" with their upper division at Berkeley, as compared with fully 42% of non-Program people.

Clearly, Program attendees were not only more satisfied with their lower division (in the Program) than the others were outside it, but also were less likely to be satisfied with their upper division experience, almost certainly by contrast in their minds with their special and intense experience in the Program. The non-Program students made the same comparison between their upper and lower division experience to the advantage of the upper division; the more focused curriculum and closer student-faculty relations in their major fields must have looked good after their two years in the lower division clearing away their "breadth requirements." No finding could be more eloquent of the special impact of the Program on its participants.

We see further confirmation of these findings in questions which asked about the students' experience with faculty members in the lower and upper divisions. For example, students in both groups were asked if there had been any any professors at Cal "whom you felt free to turn to for advice on personal matters." When speaking of the lower division experience, Program participants were more likely than non-participants to answer this question "yes" (38% vs. 21%), reflecting the closer links that at least some students had been able to forge with faculty members in the Program. By contrast, there was less difference in their replies regarding the upper division-- 20% vs 28%-- with the non-Program group more likely to have such contact with a faculty member at that level.

Looked at another way, the Program participants were twice as likely to have found such a faculty member in the Program than in the upper division. By contrast, the non-Program students were somewhat less likely to have such a relationship in lower division than they were in upper division when they were already embarked on their majors. This, and other evidence from the interviews, suggests that in some respects the Program gave students the kinds of access to faculty, and the opportunities for closer connections with them, that other students found only when they had entered their majors.

More evidence along the same lines is provided by responses to a related question asking if "there were any professors at Cal who took special interest in your academic progress." On this question over half (53%) of the Program attendees said "yes" with regard to the lower division (i.e. the Program), as compared with only a third (34%) who answered similarly with regard to the upper division. Again, by contrast, more of the non-Program group found such a faculty member in the upper division than in the lower division (38% vs 32%), though the differences there are not large. Looked at the other way, again the Program group were distinctly more likely to have found such an interested faculty member in the lower division than the non-Program participants (53% vs 32%), and a little less likely to have found such a person in the upper division ((34% vs.38%).

Another small cluster of findings suggest the impact of the Program on attitudes towards politics and towards education (where it embodied unusual forms, at least for Berkeley). For example, the questionnaire asked both groups whether they thought "undergraduate education would be improved if grades were abolished." Students who had been through the Program, where grades had been abolished, were much more likely to agree with that statement as compared with the non-Program students (who had applied but not been accepted to the Program): 47% of the former as compared with only 14% of the latter.

The Program participants had clearly been persuaded of the importance of a broad liberal education, as compared with specialized studies at Cal. A quarter of a century after going through the Program, they were distinctly more likely than non-Program people to reply "not important" to the question, "How important was it to you to get a detailed grasp of a special field when you were at Cal?": (58% vs. 36%). When a similar question is asked in the present tense, "would you agree" that "undergraduate education would be improved if there were less emphasis on specialized training and more on broad liberal education," 86% of the Program group as compared with 67% of the non-program group agreed. Since both groups had applied to the Program, they were therefore probably disposed toward the values of liberal education from the beginning; but experience in the Program clearly had an influence on these attitudes independent of their earlier sentiments and leanings.

Something of this impact comes through in responses to questions about "How important was it to you to get along with other people when you were at Cal?" and "How important was it to you to formulate the values and goals of your life when you were at Cal?" With respect to getting along with other people (surely an especially important talent in the small intense environment of the Program), only 17% of Program participants replied "not important" as compared with more than twice that many (38%) of non-Program people. On the question of formulating goals and values, something the Program stressed both explicitly and implicitly, only 7% of the Program participants replied "not important" as compared with three times as many non-Program participants (21%).

Finally, an intriguing set of answers to the questions "How would you characterize yourself politically while at Cal?" and (in a separate question) "Now?" Both groups of respondents remember themselves as quite left or liberal while at Cal: 90% of Program and 84% of non-Program people put themselves in one or the other of those categories (perhaps not surprising, considering the time when they were at Cal.) The real difference between the two groups is in the proportions who remember themselves as "left" rather than "liberal" or anything else: 44% of Program participants as compared with 26% of non-Program participants would put themselves in that category while at Cal. Referring to current politics, both groups show movement away from the category "left" (though not from "liberal", still the most popular position). Even now, Program participants are twice as likely to refer to themselves as "left" than are non-participants (29% vs 14%). But they also are now a bit more likely to hold moderate or conservative views: (32% vs 26%). Perhaps both of these are effects of the Program, which, as its participants know, had both radical and conservative dimensions, a combination at the heart of its intellectual challenge.

Again, it is important to stress that these findings are based on small and not statistically representative "samples," and no great weight should be placed on them. But they are suggestive, and are broadly consistent with what we are finding in the close study of our interviews which will carry the main burden of the study. The analysis of these questionnaires forms one relatively small part, the quantitative part, of the report on the study. The complete report based primarily on information gathered through interviews with former participants is still in preparation. We expect the report will form the basis for a book, to be completed some time next year.

I am very grateful to all of you for your participation in the study. The Experimental College Program and the impact it has had on its graduates has captured the interest of several scholars working in the field of curricular reform in higher education. I hope the final report/book will make a contribution to that field, and to the quality of undergraduate education more broadly. Thank you all for your kind and generous cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Katherine Trow

Katherine Trow, M.A.
Project Director